

ANNUAL REGISTER

A

REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME

AND ABROAD

FOR THE YEAR

1917

NEW SERIES



LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO., LTD., S. G. MADGWICK
JOHN MURRAY, J & E. BUMPUS, LTD

BICKERS & SON; J. WHELDON & CO., R & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD

1918

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

CHAPTER I

NEW YEAR TO THE MIDDLE OF MAY

The Military Situation, [1] Pie-eminent Importance of the Naval War, [3]. Unrestricted Submarine Campaign begun by the Germans, [4]. The Barred Zones, [6]. Statistics of British Shipping, [8] Ships Sunk in March and April, [9] German Retreat in France, [10]. The Battle of Aras, [12].

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE MIDDLE OF MAY TO THE FALL OF RIGA

State of the Russian Army, [14]. The Italian Offensive, [16]. The Tenth Isonzo Battle in May, [17] The Eleventh Isonzo Battle in August, [18] Russian Offensive in Galicia, [19]. Russian Collapse, [20] Recapture of Tarnopol and Czernovitz by the Austrians, [21]. The Battle of Messines, [23]. The Third Battle of Ypres, [24] Naval Incidents, [25] The Submarine Campaign during May, June, July, and August, [29] The War in the Air, [30]. The Fall of Riga, [31]

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE FALL OF RIGA TO THE END OF THE YEAR.

The Western Front, [32] British Offensive near Cambrai, [33] Austro-German Offensive against the Italians, [34] Rupture of the Italian Line at Caporetto and Tolmino, [35]. Italian Retreat to the Piave, [37] The Submarine Campaign during September, October, November, and December, [37]. Statistics of Tonnage Sunk, [38] Zeppelin Raid on England, [39]. Germans capture Oesel, [40] Armistice concluded in the East, [42]. Terms of the Armistice, [46]. Peace Negotiations between Russia and the Central Alliance opened at Brest-Litovsk, [47]. Bolshevik Proposals and Czernin's Reply, [48].

ENGLISH HISTORY

CHAPTER I.

OPENING OF THE YEAR

Minor Social Changes, [49]. Inquiry on Army Discipline, [50]. The German Banks in London, [50]. Reply to President Wilson, [51]. New War Loan, [52]. Maximum Prices for Food, [54]. Raid on the *Field*, [55]. Conference of the Labour Party, [55]. Report of the Speaker's Conference, [57]. Speeches on the War, [58]. Plot to murder Mr. Lloyd George, [59]. Result of the War Loan, [60]. Campaign for Food Economy, [60]. National Service, [61]. Opening of Parliament, [62]. National Food Production, [63]. Votes of Credit, [64]. Interview with Sir Douglas Haig, [65]. Debate on Peace, [66]. Accommodation for Government Offices, [67]. Imperial Preference, [68]. The German Submarine Menace, [69]. Restrictions on Imports, [70]. Fixing Food Prices, [71]. Mr. Lloyd George on Import Restrictions, [72]. Navy Estimates, [72-4]. National Service Bill, [74]. British Prisoners held by the Enemy, [75]. The Situation in Ireland, [76]. The Food Problem, [77]. Limitation of Consumption, [78]. Army Estimates, [79-80]. The Question of Pensions, [81]. Indian Cotton Duties, [82]. Debate, [84]. The Government of Ireland, [85]. Withdrawal of the Nationalists, [86]. Further Debate, [87]. Report of the Dardanelles Commission, [88]. Debate, [89].

CHAPTER II.

THE SUMMER MONTHS

National Service Scheme, [90]. Vote of Credit, [91]. Imperial War Cabinet, [91]. Debate on the Blockade of Germany, [93]. Military Service (Review of Exceptions) Bill, [94]. Debate on the Report of the Speaker's Conference, [94]. Strike at Barrow, [96]. The Military Service Bill, [97]. Speeches by Oversea Ministers, [98]. Army Council Inquiry, [99]. Easter Adjournment, [100]. Entry of the United States into the War, [101]. Educational Reconstruction, [102]. The Food Situation, [104]. Limitations on Consumption, [105]. Corn Production Bill, [107]. Prohibition to Export the *Nation*, [109]. Air Service, [110]. Munitions of War Bill, [111]. The Submarine Campaign, [112]. Compulsory Rationing, [113]. Food Restrictions, [114-6]. The Imperial War Conference, [117]. The Government of Ireland, [118]. The Irish Convention, [121]. The Reform Bill, [122]. Debate, [124]. Proportional Representation, [125]. Changes at the Admiralty, [126]. Vote of Credit, [127]. Secret Session, [128]. Discussions on Finance, [129]. Strike of Engineers, [130]. End of the Strike, [132]. Speech by General Smuts, [133]. The Budget, [134-5]. Suppression of Profiteering, [136]. Independent Labour Party, [137]. Air Raids, [138]. The Ministry of Munitions, [140]. Liability of Foreigners to Military Service, [141]. Corn Production Bill, [142]. Committee of Inquiry on the Military Service (Review of Exceptions) Act, [143]. The Mesopotamia Report, [144]. Debate, [145-8]. Control of the Cotton Trade, [148]. Speeches by the Prime Minister, [149]. The Food Question, [150]. Distribution of Coal, [152]. The Finance Bill, [152]. Vote of Credit, [153]. Corn Production Bill, [154]. Changes in the Government, [155]. Inquiry into the Military Service Act, [156]. Prisoners of War, [157]. Peace Debate, [158]. Corn Production Bill, [159]. Education Bill, [160]. The Stockholm Conference, [160]. Attitude of the Trades Union Congress, [161]. Position of Mr. Henderson, [162]. Army Medical Examinations, [164]. The Food Position, [165]. Threatened Railway Strike, [166]. Maximum Prices for Food, [167]. Control of Woollen Industry, [168]. Trades Union Congress, [169]. The Irish Convention, [170]. Succession of Air-Raids, [171]. Speech by Mr. Lloyd George, [172]. National War Bonds, [173]. Appeals for Economy, [174]. Adjournment of the House, [175]. The Problem of Man-Power, [176].

CHAPTER III.

THE AUTUMN SESSION.

Re-assembling of Parliament, [177]. The Reform Bill, [177] The Irish Situation, [178] Vote of Credit, [179]. Report of Committee on National Expenditure, [179]. Reorganisation of the Labour Party, [180]. Sale of Honours, [180]. Disfranchisement of Conscientious Objectors, [181] The Air Council, [181] Increase of Pay for Soldiers and Sailors, [182] Food Control, [183]. The Man-Power Problem, [184] Allied War Council, [184] Discontent among Railwaymen, [185] Lord Lansdowne on Peace by Negotiation, [186] The Franchise Bill, [187]. The Non-Ferrous Metals Bill, [188]. Vote of Credit, [189]. Conscientious Objectors, [190] Shortage of Food, [191] Memorandum of the Labour Party on Peace, [192]. Speeches on War-Aims, [193] Changes at the Admiralty, [194].

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY *page* [195]

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY [208]

CHAPTER III

RUSSIA, FINLAND, POLAND, TURKEY, AND THE MINOR STATES OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE [232]

CHAPTER IV

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE BELGIUM—LUXEMBURG—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—SWEDEN—NORWAY [267]

CHAPTER V

SOUTHERN ASIA CYPRUS—THE HEJAZ—PERSIA—AFGHANISTAN—BOKHARA AND KHIVA—INDIA—SIAM [233]

CHAPTER VI.

THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN [291]

CHAPTER VII.

AFRICA THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA—RHODESIA—NYASALAND—PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA—PORTUGUESE WEST AFRICA—GERMAN EAST AFRICA—BRITISH EAST AFRICA—LIBERIA—TRIPOLI—MOROCCO—ABYSSINIA—EGYPT—THE SUDAN [300]

CHAPTER VIII.

AMERICA THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA* AND ITS DEPENDENCIES—	page [309]
CANADA—NEWFOUNDLAND—GREENLAND—MEXICO—BRAZIL—ARGENTINA—CHILI—URUGUAY—OTHER REPUBLICS	

CHAPTER IX.

AUSTRALASIA AUSTRALIA—NEW ZEALAND	[334]
---	-------

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS IN 1917	page 1
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS	24
Summary of the Report of the Dardanelles Commission, 24—Summary of the Report of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56—Summary of the Report of the Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform, 80.	
RETROSPECT OF THE YEAR'S LITERATURE, SCIENCE, ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC	88
FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1917	143
OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1917	151
INDEX	209

PREFATORY NOTE

THE Editor of the ANNUAL REGISTER thinks it necessary to state that in no case does he claim to offer original reports of speeches in Parliament or elsewhere. He has much pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to *The Times* for the special permission accorded him to make use of its Parliamentary reports and other matter; and he hereby expresses his thanks to that journal for the valuable assistance which he has derived from the facilities thus extended to him.

THE MINISTRY, 1917.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury

Mr D. Lloyd George

Lord President of the Council

Lord Curzon

Ministers without Portfolio

Lord Milner, Sir E. Carson (*since July 17*), Mr A.

Henderson (*till Aug 11*), then Mr G. Barnes

Chancellor of the Exchequer

Mr Bonar Law

The above formed the War Cabinet

Lord Chancellor

Lord Finlay.

Lord Privy Seal

Lord Crawford

Secretaries of State —

Home Affairs

Sir George Cave, K. C.

Foreign Affairs

Mr Arthur Balfour

Colonies

Mr W. Long

India

Mr Austen Chamberlain (*till July 10*), then Mr E. S.

Montagu

War

Lord Derby

Minister of Munitions

Mr Addison (*till July 17*); then Mr. Winston Churchill

Director of National Service

Mr Neville Chamberlain (*till August*), then Sir Auck-land Geddes

Minister of Labour

Mr J. Hodge (*till August*), then Mr G. H. Roberts.

Pensions Minister

Mr G. Barnes (*till August*), then Mr J. Hodge.

Minister of Reconstruction

Dr Addison (*from July 17*)

Minister of Blockade

Lord Robert Cecil, K. C.

First Lord of the Admiralty

Sir Edward Carson, K. C. (*till July 17*), then Sir Eric

Geddes, G. B. E.

President of the Air Board

Lord Cowdray (*till Nov 16*), then Lord Rothermere.

Food Controller

Lord Devonport (*till June 15*); then Lord Rhondda

Shipping Controller

Sir J. P. Maclay, Bart.

President of the Board of Trade

Sir A. Stanley

President of the Local Government Board

Lord Rhondda (*till June 28*), then Mr. W. Hayes

Fisher

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster

Sir F. Cawley, Bart.

Chief Secretary for Ireland

Mr H. E. Duke, K. C.

Secretary for Scotland

Mr. Munro, K. C.

President of the Board of Agriculture

Mr R. E. Piothero

First Commissioner of Works

Sir A. Mond, Bart.

President of the Board of Education

Mr H. A. L. Fisher.

Attorney-General

Mr F. E. Smith, K. C.

Postmaster-General

Mr A. Illingworth

Solicitor-General

Sir Gordon Hewart, K. C.

Parl. Under-Secretaries —

Home Affairs

Mr W. Brace

Foreign Affairs

Lord Robert Cecil, K. C.

Colonies

Mr. Steel-Maitland, then Mr. A. S. Hewins.

India

Lord Islington

Was

Mr. J. I. Macpherson.

Financial Secretaries —

To the Treasury

Mr S. H. Lever (*till Jan 30*), then Mr. S. Baldwin.

To the War Office

Mr. H. W. Forster.

<i>Civil Lord of the Admiralty</i>	Mr E G. Pretyman.
<i>Parliamentary Secretaries.</i> —	
<i>Admiralty</i>	Dr. Macnamara.
<i>Board of Trade</i>	Mr G H Roberts (<i>till Aug.</i>), then Mr. G. J. Waidle.
<i>Local Govt Board</i>	Mr. W Hayes Fisher (<i>till June 28</i>), then Mr. Stephen Walsh.
<i>Board of Agriculture</i>	Sir R Winfrey.
<i>Board of Education</i>	Mr Herbert Lewis
<i>Munitions</i>	Sir L Worthington Evans, Bart., and Mr. Kellaway
<i>Ministry of National Service.</i>	Mr C Beck
<i>Ministry of Labour</i>	Mr. W C. Bridgeman
<i>Ministry of Food</i>	Capt C Bathurst (<i>till Aug.</i>), then Mr. J. R. Clynes
<i>Paymaster-General</i>	Sir J Compton-Ricketts.
<i>Assistant Postmaster-General</i>	Mr. Pike Pease
<i>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury</i>	Lord Edmund Talbot and the Hon. Neil Pimrose, succeeded by the Hon. F E Guest.
<i>Junior Lords of the Treasury</i>	Mr J F Hope, Mr. James Parker, Mr. J. W. Pratt; Rev T Jones.

SCOTLAND.

<i>Lord-Advocate</i>	Mr. J. A. Clyde, K.C.
<i>Solicitor-General</i>	Mr. T B Morrison, K.C.

IRELAND

<i>Lord Lieutenant</i>	Lord Wimborne
<i>Lord Chancellor</i>	Sir I. J. O'Brien, K.C.

ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1917.

PART I.

THE WAR.

CHAPTER I.

NEW YEAR TO THE MIDDLE OF MAY

THE course of events in 1916 had not altered fundamentally the general military situation which had existed at the beginning of that year. The strategic and geographic positions of the opposing groups of armies in January, 1917, were not very different from those which they had respectively held twelve months earlier, and in the Western theatre of operations the positions were, indeed, almost completely unchanged. In the West the line of the German Army still commenced on the coast of the North Sea, near Westende, and from thence ran southwards, east of Ypres and west of La Bassée and Lens, and then east of Arras and across the Ancre and Somme rivers. In this locality a small advance had been made by the Franco-British armies in the previous year, the town of Combles having been reconquered from the Germans. South of the Somme the course of the German line turned eastwards, running past Rheims to Verdun, north and east of which town trivial territorial advantages had been gained by the Germans in 1916. East of Verdun the line turned southwards again, and ran north-east of Nancy into Alsace, a small section of German territory thus being occupied by the French; and the left wing of the German Army rested upon the Swiss frontier, very close to the spot at which France, Germany, and Switzerland met.

In the Italian theatre two small changes in the lines of the opposing armies had occurred during 1916. From Switzerland

eastwards past Lake Garda the Austrian line ran along the frontier, but east of Lake Garda the Austrians had made a small net gain of ground during the previous year, and their line crossed the frontier here into Italian territory. At the beginning of 1917, however, the Italians held Arsiero and Asiago, although they had temporarily lost both of these towns during 1916. Eastwards of Asiago the Austrian line passed within Austrian territory again, and in the extreme eastern section of this theatre the Italians had advanced a considerable distance into Austria and held the lower reaches of the Isonzo from Tolmino southwards to the mouth of that river. The town of Gorizia (Gorz) had been captured by the Italians in August, 1916. Thus from a territorial point of view, the Italians had won slight advantages over their enemy in the campaigning of 1916.

In the Balkan theatre, from which, at the opening of the year Rumania was strategically excluded, the Central Empires had more than maintained the enormous territorial gains which they had made before the beginning of 1916. They occupied all Montenegro, all except the extreme south of Albania, all Serbia except the town and immediate environs of Monastir, and also the eastern portion of Greece, including the port of Kavalla. The Entente army, which had been in Greece since October, 1915, had gained one appreciable success in 1916 by the reconquest of Monastir from the Bulgarians. This Balkan army continued to be based upon Salonika and was still under the command of General Sarrail.

In the main Eastern theatre, with which the new Rumanian front must be included, changes had taken place on a much larger scale than any which had occurred in the Western, Italian, and Balkan theatres. Yet large as these changes were, they did not alter fundamentally the purely military aspect of the Russian campaign, though one of the changes—the Austro-German conquest of Wallachia—was of the highest importance in relation to the economic side of the war. The enormous swamps around the river Prut had the effect of cutting the Eastern theatre into two divisions, which were largely independent of each other. The opposing lines passed across these marshes, but this dismal and in many places impassable country was of necessity thinly held both by the Russians and by the Germans. On the German front north of the marshes no change of any consequence had occurred in 1916. The German line began on the Baltic coast, a few miles west of Riga, passed along the left bank of the Dvina, as far as Dvinsk (Dunaburg), which the Tsar's troops still held. At Dvinsk the German line left the course of the Dvina, and ran southwards to the neighbourhood of the railway junction of Molodetchno, which, however, remained in Russian hands. The line continued southwards, cutting the main Warsaw-Moscow railway about fifty miles west of Minsk, immediately

to the east of the junction of Baranovitche. The German line entered the swamps at Pinsk, that town being in the possession of the invaders

In the region south of the river Pripet large changes had taken place during 1916. Immediately to the south of that great river the German line now ran along the left bank of the tributary stream named the Stokhod, and passed about twenty miles eastward of the railway junction of Kovel. The opposing lines entered Galicia close to the point at which the river Styr leaves that province, and then passed southwards to the Carpathians, leaving the town of Brody to the east, this place having been conquered by the Russians (for the second time in this war) during the previous year. The line then ran along the north-eastern slope of the Carpathian range as far as, and somewhat beyond, the point where Bukovina, Hungary, and Rumania met, and it then struck straight across Rumania, running a few miles south-east of the river Sereth. The whole of that district of Rumania which lies between the Danube and the Black Sea, and which is known as the Dobrudja, was in German hands. Thus it will be seen that in the terrain between the Pripet river and the Rumanian frontier the Russians had made large gains during 1916, whilst within Rumania itself the Germans had achieved even greater territorial successes, and had occupied Bukarest. The German conquest of Wallachia did not affect materially the purely military side of the Russian campaign, but from the economic point of view, as already indicated, it was a very important success for the enemy.

It remains to state the position in the Middle East where Armenia and Persia together constituted a single theatre of war. The Russian line commenced on the coast of the Black Sea a few miles west of Trebizond, passed south of Erzerum and Mush, and south of Lake Van into Peisia. It then ran south of Lake Urmia and north of Hamadan, eastwards of which town the positions became more undefined. A large district of Persia, including Kermanshah and Hamadan, was occupied by a Turkish Army, but the Russians held Teheran itself. In the Middle East, where the fighting extended over such an enormous area, there existed, of course, no continuous lines of opposing trench-fortifications, such as were to be seen on the Western and Russian fronts.

This, then, was the general military situation in Europe at the beginning of January; but it was not upon the purely military aspect of the conflict that the attention of belligerents and onlookers was mainly concentrated at this time. The war at sea, and that terrible economic contest with which the naval war was inseparably connected, constituted the most vital part of the whole colossal struggle for supremacy. Many persons believed that a decisive victory for either side, attained by purely military means, was a very improbable

contingency. A decisive German advance upon Petrograd, Moscow, Paris, or even Rome, appeared to be a possibility which was so remote as to be negligible for purposes of practical politics. And an overwhelming advance by the Entente Armies into Germany, either across the Rhine or through Warsaw and East Prussia, was scarcely less improbable. The military deadlock, which had been modified but never broken even by such gigantic operations as the capture of Warsaw in 1915, remained as fixed as ever. There existed, however, a much greater possibility that a definite result would be reached through naval activities. The British and French fleets had been blockading Central Europe for two and a half years, and the scarcity of food caused in this way was so severe that it was admittedly doubtful whether Germany and Austria-Hungary could endure until the next harvest, even by submitting to a rigid system of much reduced rations. In this way it seemed conceivable that the Central Powers might be compelled to capitulate unconditionally. On the other hand, early in the year the German Government instituted a "blockade" of Great Britain which was put into operation by submarine warships; and it was widely hoped in Germany that this novel form of blockade would cause the complete collapse of Great Britain, and thereby the overthrow of the whole alliance. In their submarines the German Government saw a gleam of hope of definite victory. From the time of the Battle of the Marne, when the original German plan was completely upset, to the beginning of 1917, Germany was fighting not so much to gain victory as to prevent defeat and obtain a drawn war. But with the coming of the new submarine blockade, now to be described, there arose in Germany once more a hope that the war might end with a German victory. Thus in respect both of the British and of the German blockade, the naval war must be given precedence of the military operations.

THE FIRST THREE MONTHS OF THE GERMAN SUBMARINE CAMPAIGN.

During the first thirty months of the war the German war-submarines played only a minor part in the great struggle. This was mainly due to two causes. In the first place, the submarines which Germany possessed at the beginning of the war, and for months afterwards, were small vessels of from 300 to 500 tons, and the British Navy found effective methods of destroying these little ships. Secondly, even the larger submarines which the German Government subsequently built were found to be effective against merchantmen only, not against warships, and through the intervention of the American Government in the spring of 1916, the German Government were constrained to impose restrictions on the actions of their submarines which very greatly diminished the menace to the mercantile marine.

After the sinking of the steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine in March, 1916, the American Government, under the threat of war, exacted a conditional promise from the German Government that no merchantmen, even if armed for defensive purposes, should be sunk by submarines without warning or without due respect for the safety of the passengers and crew. This promise was conditional in that the German Government requested the American Ministry to endeavour to induce Great Britain and her Allies to forego those features of the blockade of Germany which were alleged to be contrary to International Law, and stated that in the event of the American Government failing to obtain this concession, the German Government would hold themselves free to remove the restrictions on the activities of the submarines, if they so desired. (See A.R. 1916, p. 333.)

The American Government did not succeed in inducing Great Britain to modify her methods of blockading Germany, nor did President Wilson even make any very determined effort to do so. It is true that both before and after the *Sussex* incident the American Cabinet expressed the view that certain aspects of the Allies' blockade appeared to be contrary to International Law, and the suggestion was made that the Allies should abandon the attempt to starve the civil population of Central Europe; but the points in dispute were never seriously pressed by the President. It is clear that at the end of 1916, probably as soon as Herr von Jagow, the German Foreign Minister, had retired (see *Germany*), the Government at Washington must have become aware that Germany was about to recall the promise given after the sinking of the *Sussex*, and the great efforts made by President Wilson in December to secure a general peace were no doubt largely due to his direct anxiety to prevent his own country becoming involved in the war. The United States Government knew that if the German and American efforts to persuade the Allies to enter into peace negotiations failed, the German Government would renew the unrestricted submarine campaign against merchant shipping. And that was what happened.

On January 31 Herr Zimmermann, the new Foreign Minister, presented a Note to Mr. Gerard, the United States Ambassador in Berlin, which withdrew the promise given after the *Sussex* incident and inaugurated the era of unrestricted attacks upon merchantmen by the German submarines. The Note (which is quoted more fully under "*Germany*") referred first to President Wilson's address to Congress on January 22 and expressed the agreement of the Imperial Government with many of the opinions and aspirations of the President. The Note explained that owing to the continuance of the British blockade and the refusal of the Entente to enter into peace negotiations, the Imperial Executive was now compelled "to abandon the limitations which it has hitherto imposed on itself in the

employment of its fighting weapons at sea. Trusting that the American people and their Government will not close their eyes to the reasons for this resolution and its necessity, the Imperial Government hopes that the United States will appreciate the new state of affairs from the high standpoint of impartiality, and will also on their part help to prevent further misery and a sacrifice of human lives which might be avoided. While I venture, as regards details of the projected war measures, to refer to the attached Memorandum, I venture at the same time to express the expectation that the American Government will warn American ships against entering the barred zones described in the Annexe, and its subjects against entrusting passengers or goods to vessels trading with harbours in the barred zones."

The Memorandum which is mentioned in the above passage as being annexed to the German Note is of strategic interest and may be quoted here in full. It stated that. "From February 1, 1917, all sea traffic in the hereafter designated barred zones (Sperrgebiete) around Great Britain, France, and Italy, and in the Eastern Mediterranean, will without further notice be prevented by all weapons. These barred zones are.—

"A. (In the North Sea) The area around England and France, delimited by a line at 20 nautical miles distance along the Dutch coast to the Terschelling Lightship degree of longitude, from the Terschelling Lightship to Udsire (off the Norwegian coast), thence in a line over a point 62° north latitude, 0° longitude, to 62° north, 5° west, further to a point 3 miles south of Faroe, thence over a point 62° north, 15° west; then 57° north, 20° west, 47° north, 20° west; further to 43° north, 15° west; then along latitude 43° north to 20 nautical miles from Cape Finisterre, and at 20 nautical miles distance along the north coast of Spain to the French frontier.

"B. (In the Mediterranean) To neutral shipping the marine area remains open west of a line drawn from Point de Les Pignettes (Gulf of Lyons) to 38° 20' north and 6° east, as well as north and west of a strip 60 nautical miles wide, along the North African coast, beginning at 2 degrees west longitude. In order to connect this marine area with Greece a strip 20 nautical miles wide runs north or east respectively of the following line: 38° north and 6° east to 38° north and 10° east, to 37° north and 11° 30' east, to 34° north and 11° 30' east, to 34° north, and 22° 30' east. From here a strip 20 nautical miles wide runs west of longitude 22° 30' east into Greek territorial waters.

"Neutral ships which navigate the barred zones will do so at their own risk. Even though provision be made that neutral ships which on February 1 are *en route* to ports in the barred zones will be spared during an appropriate period, it is nevertheless urgently advisable that they be directed by all means available into other routes. Neutral ships which are lying in harbours in the barred zones can with equal security still leave

the barred zones if they depart before February 5 and take the shortest route to a free zone.

" The traffic of regular American passenger steamers can continue to proceed unmolested on the following conditions:—

" (a) If Falmouth is taken as the port of destination

" (b) If on the voyage out and back vessels are steered for the Scillies as well as to a point 50° north and 20° west On this route no German mines will be laid

" (c) If steamers show the following special signs which in American harbours are permitted to them (American vessels) alone, namely, the hull and superstructure to be painted with vertical stripes, three meters wide, alternately white and red ; on each mast to be a large white and red flag chequered , at the stern the American national flag. During darkness the national flag and the painting to be as recognisable as possible from afar, and the vessels to be thoroughly and brightly illuminated

" (d) If one steamer goes weekly in each direction arriving at Falmouth on Sunday and departing on Wednesday

" (e) If the guarantee of the American Government is given that these steamers carry no contraband (according to the German contraband list)

" Further, Germany is prepared, in view of the need for Continental passenger traffic, that every weekday a Dutch paddle-steamer shall receive free and unobstructed right of passage in each direction between Flushing and Southwold, on condition that the said paddle-steamers only pass through the barred zones by daylight, and that they steer by the North Hinder Lightship, both on the outward and homeward voyage On this route no German mines will be laid The marks on the ships making these voyages to be the same as those given regarding American passenger steamers

" Two maps are attached in which the barred zones are shown. Corresponding notes have been delivered to the Governments of other neutral States."

The above was the communication which served to inaugurate this new and desperate phase of the war. As the Memorandum and the accompanying maps showed all the waters surrounding the British Islands and the whole of the northern and western coasts of France, as also the eastern Mediterranean, were barred A small sector of the south coast of France was, however, left free, and although Italy was of course completely surrounded by a war-zone, a passage was provided for ships going to neutral Greece.

The removal of the restrictions on submarines caused the United States of America to enter the ranks of the enemies of Germany (see U S A.), but it also caused an immediate and very serious increase in the shipping losses of the Entente Powers The new campaign was of course directed especially against Great Britain Now the total tonnage of the British mercantile marine was approximately 20,000,000 gross register

tons, of which over 8,000,000 tons were being utilised for war purposes, thereby greatly reducing the number of ships available for the importation of ordinary necessaries into the United Kingdom. During February, the first month of the unrestricted submarine warfare, the British merchant ships sunk represented approximately 500,000 tons. Hence if this rate of destruction were maintained, the enemy could expect to sink 6,000,000 tons of British shipping in a year. Against this loss, the results of the rapid construction of new craft must be placed. It was believed, however, that even with assistance from America, to build merchant ships to the extent of 3,000,000 tons in a year would require, under war conditions, the very greatest energy and effort, and would represent the maximum possible achievement, so that Great Britain was faced at the end of February with the serious possibility of a net loss of over 3,000,000 tons of shipping, that is, of about 16 per cent. of her mercantile marine, within twelve months. It was thus clear that unless an effective method of destroying the German submarines were discovered, the losses of shipping would necessitate, by the end of 1917, a restriction either of the importation of food and other necessaries into Great Britain or of the carriage of supplies to the British Armies overseas, or of both, and that the new campaign threatened actual disaster to the cause of the Allies in the following year.

The losses of ships belonging to the other Entente Powers and to neutral States must also not be forgotten. Within the war-zones the Germans destroyed neutral shipping in the most ruthless manner; in particular, a large number of Norwegian vessels were sunk. This factor, though very appreciable, was of course of much less importance than the destruction of British ships. Before the new submarine campaign about 3,000,000 tons of neutral (including American) shipping were employed in traffic with the United Kingdom.

During February fairly full particulars of the British losses were published, the names of most of the individual ships being made known. As already stated, the British ships destroyed aggregated about 500,000 tons, the average tonnage per vessel being approximately 3,100, if fishing-boats be excluded from the reckoning. These figures indicated a serious acceleration in the rate of destruction as compared with the period before February 1. In the first thirty months of the war, the British shipping losses amounted to only 8,000,000 tons, that is, an average of 100,000 tons per month. In December, 1916 the loss rose to 250,000 tons, and the Germans wrought about the same destruction in January, 1917. Thus the removal of the restrictions on submarines had the immediate effect of doubling their powers of destruction. From the end of February onwards the British Government published a weekly return of the British shipping losses, but the practice of publishing the names of individual vessels was discontinued, and the aggregate

tonnage destroyed was also not stated in the returns. The first of these official reports related to the week ending February 25, and gave the following particulars.—

1. Arrivals and sailings of merchant vessels of all nationalities (over 100 tons net) at and from United Kingdom ports (exclusive of fishing and local craft) (a) arrivals 2,280; (b) sailings 2,261

2 British merchant vessels sunk by mine or submarine (a) 1,600 tons (gross) or over—15, (b) under 1,600 tons (gross)—6

3 British merchant vessels unsuccessfully attacked by submarines—12

4 British fishing vessels sunk—4.

The more important data contained in the reports published during the next five weeks are shown in the following table—

Week Ending	Arrivals at United Kingdom Ports	Sailings from United Kingdom Ports	Sunk Over 1,600 Tons	Sunk Under 1,600 Tons	British Ships Unsuccessfully Attacked by Submarines
March 4	2,528	2,477	14	9	16
" 11	1,985	1,959	13	4	16
" 18	2,528	2,554	16	8	19
" 25	2,314	2,433	18	7	18
April 1	2,281	2,399	18	13	17

It will be noticed that during these five weeks, that is, roughly during the month of March, 120 British vessels were sunk by submarines or mines. If it be assumed, as it is no doubt legitimate to assume, that the average tonnage of the vessels sunk remained approximately the same as during February, then the conclusion reached is that slightly less than 400,000 tons of British shipping were destroyed during March. The figures for April revealed, however, an increase which was nothing less than alarming—

Week Ending	Arrivals at United Kingdom Ports	Sailings from United Kingdom Ports	Sunk Over 1,600 Tons	Sunk Under 1,600 Tons	British Ships Unsuccessfully Attacked by Submarines
April 8	2,406	2,367	17	2	14
" 15	2,379	2,331	21	9	16
" 22	2,585	2,621	41	16	28
" 29	2,716	2,690	35	12	22

As the above table shows, 153 British ships were reported sunk during these four weeks, representing, in all probability, slightly under 500,000 tons. The extraordinary feature in this series is of course the sudden and startling increase of losses in the third week of April.

Thus the British losses for the first three months of the new

submarine campaign reached a total of nearly 1,500,000 tons, a rate of destruction which, if it were maintained, would gravely imperil the cause of the Entente Powers in the year 1918

THE GERMAN RETREAT IN THE WEST

The military operations in the Western theatre opened with a great German retreat. The movement was of a kind altogether new to the French Front. In one sense it was true to call the operation now carried out a voluntary retirement, but in another sense it was quite involuntary. When Marshal von Hindenburg became Chief of the German General Staff, a position which the German War Lord had sufficient sagacity to make, for all practical purposes, that of Commander-in-Chief, the great strategist turned his mind seriously to the problems of the Western campaign, and in so doing he reached conclusions different from those of his predecessor. The defensive line held by the German Army had originated largely through chance. The existing line had represented the first convenient and defensible position upon which the Germans could turn at bay after the great defeat on the Marne. And although indentations had been made in their line they had succeeded in clinging with desperate obstinacy to these positions from September, 1914, till February, 1917. And so long as the authorities in Berlin contemplated the possibility of any new offensives in France, it was clearly against their interests to yield voluntarily a single mile of soil. It was not until the effort to take Verdun had been finally and very reluctantly abandoned late in the summer of 1916 that the German Staff brought themselves to admit the truth that to take the offensive against the superior Franco-British Army could only involve them in useless and sanguinary reverses. The steady accumulation of munitions by the French and of both men and munitions by the British had given the Western Powers an unassailable preponderance of strength, and thus it came about that von Hindenburg decided to adopt a purely defensive strategy on his Western Front.

The new plan freed the Germans from the necessity of holding every mile of the territory which they happened to be occupying when they stayed their retreat in 1914. The invaders were now at liberty to station themselves on the strongest line which might be consistent with the retention of all those points, such as the Belgian coast, that were vital to the general conduct of the war in the West, they were no longer compelled to occupy the most advanced line. Hence the world witnessed in the spring a great withdrawal of the northern sections of the German Army to what came to be known as the "Hindenburg Line." It was a cause of special satisfaction in England that the large sector of the German front which was withdrawn included that part of the line which the British had assaulted so desperately in the Battle of the Somme, and that the towns,

notably Bapaume, which had been the British objectives in that battle were now, six months later, rapidly falling into the hands of the deliverers. And, moreover, apart altogether from the change in the general conception of German strategy, it is certainly very possible that the enemy's staff may have thought it not merely undesirable but actually impracticable to hold longer the positions in the Somme district which had been pounded with such terrific energy by the British guns during the previous summer and autumn.

Thus the reader will perceive that the retreat, as stated at the outset, was both voluntary and involuntary. In that it was not the direct and immediate result of a Franco-British assault, for no such assault took place at this time, and in that the retreating troops lost but very few men and guns, the retirement was voluntary. But since it was caused by the superiority of force now attained by the Western Allies in general, and by the earlier offensive of the British on the Somme in particular, the withdrawal was altogether contrary to the original wishes of the invaders, and the change in the German strategy, of which the retreat was the signal, was itself an open confession of relative weakness.

In February, shortly before the commencement of the German retreat, the British forces relieved the French Army of another sector of the long line in France. It will be remembered that in the campaign of the previous year the British held that portion of the line extending from the north side of Ypres to the north (right) bank of the Somme, a few miles to the west of Péronne. In the new year, however, the British right wing was extended another 80 miles farther south, and thus reached the immediate vicinity of Roye.

It was on the British front that the backward movement of the German troops began. Several advanced positions, such as the village of Grandcourt, were yielded up early in February, but the large movement did not begin until February 25. North of the Somme the Germans got clear of their advanced lines without the British troops facing them becoming aware of what was happening, and for two or three days the British commanders did not realise that the enemy were in truth initiating a really large retreat. There was nothing especially surprising in this ignorance. The extraordinarily subterraneous character of modern warfare renders it easier than heretofore for a general to withdraw his advanced lines without disclosing the operation to his adversary, and the reader may be reminded of the remarkably successful British withdrawals from Gallipoli, where the preliminary operations were not dissimilar.

During the next fortnight the movement was extended northwards and southwards until by the middle of March the entire German line from Arras to Soissons was falling back swiftly towards the Belgian frontier. The distance between the two extreme points of the retreat was about 70 miles in a

straight line, but the actual fighting front involved was, owing to the curves of the front, much longer—at least 120 miles. Of this sector, the British held about 80 miles and the French about 40 miles. Before the end of February, eleven villages were recaptured, and the retirement gathering speed as it progressed, the British entered Bapaume in triumph on March 16. Two days later Péronne, Nesle, and Chaulnes were captured, and at this stage both the British and French sent cavalry in pursuit of the foe. The small town of Ham fell to the French on March 19. By March 22 the centre of the German retreating line had reached a point about 4 miles west of St. Quentin, and on this date the middle sector of the line ceased to retire and occupied the new fortified positions which had been prepared. The Franco-British advance was least deep on that section of the 120 mile front on which the advance had taken place in the previous year, that is to say, between Grandcourt and Chaulnes, and was deepest northwards of Grandcourt nearly as far as Arras, and southwards of Chaulnes as far as Soissons. The maximum depth of the advance was nearly 20 miles, this being the distance between the old Allied front west of Roye and the new Allied line east of Ham. The distance from Lassigny, which the Germans held in February, to Chauny, is also about 20 miles. On the main road from Bapaume to Cambrai, the British advanced about 8 miles beyond the former town. Between Arras and Bapaume, that is, north of the region of the advance of 1916, the German retreat also reached a depth of not less than 15 miles.

By this manœuvre, the Crown Prince of Bavaria, who was in command of the entire German front from the sea to Soissons, succeeded in reducing the length of his line by about 40 miles, thereby obtaining, of course, a corresponding economy of man-power; but in so doing he yielded up a very considerable area of France to its rightful owners. The totals of men and guns captured during the retreat were less satisfactory to the Allies. During March, in spite of the great retreat, the British took only 1,239 prisoners and captured only 3 field-guns.

THE FRANCO-BRITISH OFFENSIVES IN APRIL.

Less than three weeks after the termination of the German retreat Sir Douglas Haig, the Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in France, launched a new offensive against this same section of the German front. The assault began on April 9 and the most critical fighting took place west of Lens, though the conflict extended many miles south-eastwards, as far as the environs of St. Quentin. Near Lens the British captured a long low hill, known as the "Vimy Ridge," which had long been vigorously contested, as it was believed completely to dominate Lens and, indeed, the country for 10 miles to the north-east. This ridge was carried by Canadian

troops in a few hours and was subsequently successfully held by them ; but in the result it was proved not to be the key of Lens, for the Germans maintained their hold on that town, notwithstanding that the British reached the suburbs and clung to the broken fortifications therein for several days. On the first day of the offensive, 9,000 Germans were captured, and 4,000 more prisoners were taken in the next three days. Moreover, from April 9 to 13, 170 guns fell into the hands of the British

In spite of these preliminary successes, however, the course of the offensive was similar to that of all other offensives on the Western Front, whether German or Franco-British, since the establishment of the system of trench-fortifications at the end of September, 1914 ; the advanced lines of the defenders were destroyed and captured, but the supporting fortifications were successfully held

On April 16, the French, now under the command of General Nivelle, delivered an attack on the entire front from Soissons to Rheims, the assault being preceded by the usual severe bombardment, which in this case lasted ten days. The first line of the German fortifications was captured from Soissons to the neighbourhood of Berry-au-Bac, and 10,000 prisoners were taken on the first day, but after these preliminary successes the French were unable to make any appreciable progress, and the failure naturally caused keen disappointment in France. On April 17 the offensive was extended eastwards as far as Aubérive, that village being captured and over 2,000 prisoners being taken. The French captured about 80 guns in three days. The Germans had strengthened this part of their front in anticipation of the offensive, and according to the French General Staff the enemy mustered nineteen divisions between Soissons and Aubérive. Determined counter-attacks were delivered by the Germans, but none of these met with more than trifling success, and the Germans only claimed to have captured 3,000 prisoners

The moderate results of the British offensive in the north, which came to be known as the Battle of Arras, and of the French offensive further south, which was called the Second Battle of the Aisne, was no doubt mainly due to the enormous inherent advantages possessed by the defending side in modern warfare ; but the difficulties of the Allies had been unexpectedly enhanced by the Russian Revolution, which had upset the calculations of the French and British General Staffs. After the Revolution, which took place in March, fighting ceased almost completely in the Eastern theatre, and for several months the state of affairs there was almost tantamount to an informal armistice. This enabled the Germans to transfer a large number of regiments to the West, and by the end of April 170 German divisions were massed in France and Belgium, these forces constituting more than two-thirds of the entire

German Army Whether the Franco-British offensives in April would have succeeded in breaking through the enemy's lines if Russia had continued to play her part must of course remain a matter for speculation, for at the best the task was a desperately arduous one; but that the difficulties were in fact much greater even than was anticipated when the Allied plans were completed in February is certain

During the month of April the British captured 19,343 prisoners and the French took over 20,000, and the British took 257 guns, 227 trench-mortars, and 470 machine-guns. It is instructive to compare these statistics with those relating to the month of March, which were given above

CHAPTER II

FROM THE MIDDLE OF MAY TO THE FALL OF RIGA.

THE fourth summer campaign was characterised and greatly influenced by the unprecedented and astonishing conditions which prevailed on the Russian Front. The outbreak of the Revolution undermined, and in many regiments and some entire divisions virtually destroyed, the discipline of the Russian soldiers. Hundreds of thousands of the simple Russian soldiers imagined that the Revolution would bring about the immediate inauguration of a blissful Millennium, in which there could be no place for war. The half-superstitious and somewhat pathetic reverence for the monarch which had filled the minds of the primitive peasants only a few years before, had now given place to an equally dreamy and equally pathetic idealism, which aspired to a universal brotherhood and to the spread of kindness between all men. And along large sections of the Front, especially where the Russians faced Austrians, the soldiers, freed by the Revolution from the control of their officers, proceeded immediately to put these high sentiments into practice. They ceased to fire, they walked out from the trenches, hurled their rifles upon the ground and stuck their bayonets into the turf, and by every gesture signified to their delighted adversaries that they had had more than enough of fighting. The humane man may understand though he cannot condone this sudden reversion to a natural human repugnance from the horrible and sickening slaughter of men by men, for it must be noted here that this unorganised expression of sentiment in the East reacted with painful severity upon Russia's Allies in the West. Moreover, the fraternisation with Germans and Austrians was not the only expression of the revolutionary spirit. There were other and still more sinister developments. International Socialism, with which the urban proletariat had now largely inoculated the peasant soldiery, endeavours to dissuade the common folk from hating other nations, but it rarely discontents the most bitter hatred of other sections of a man's

fellow-countrymen. Thus it came about that hundreds of Russian officers were murdered in cold blood by their own men, many of them for no other reason than that they happened to be officers. And hundreds of thousands of soldiers, encouraged by the proclamations of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates and by the teachings of the extremists, deserted the Front and spread over the interior of Russia. And none dared hinder them.

The German and Austro-Hungarian authorities were not slow to take advantage of this extraordinary situation. They encouraged by every means in their power the fraternisation of their own men with the Russian troops, hoping to convert the informal truce into an official armistice and ultimately into a separate peace with Russia. The fraternisation was, as already stated, especially cordial on the Galician Front, because amongst the Russians, as, indeed, with most of the Allied troops, except the Italians, there had always been less animosity against the Austrians than against the Germans. But conditions were not very different farther north. And in Lithuania during the spring the German generals organised trips for the Lettish and Lithuanian soldiers, these men being permitted to visit their homes, situated in many cases long distances westward of the German Front. The Letts were then duly conveyed back to their own lines, where, it was hoped, they would propagate ideas of peace. This *de facto* armistice lasted for more than three months, from the end of March until the end of June. The use which the German authorities made of the opportunities afforded to them by the Revolution was, it may be noted, highly significant, and constituted a silent tribute to the power of the Western Allies in general and of Great Britain in particular. They made use of the situation in order to obtain a respite from the Eastern War. They took merely a negative not a positive advantage of the situation. Now it is difficult to imagine that a dominant Germany, the Germany of 1915, would not have seized the chance afforded by the revolutionary disorganisation to strike an overwhelming blow at the Eastern foe. At the time of the triumphant Warsaw Campaign the Central Powers were able to parry with ease the French, British, and Italian assaults. But in 1917 these attacks strained to the utmost all the resources and determination of the defence. And the German General Staff were so anxious about the stability of their lines in France and Flanders that they transferred division after division from East to West, and through many weeks attempted no offensive against the demoralised mob which was all that confronted them in Russia. Nothing could indicate more clearly than this the remarkable growth of British land-power. And when at last operations were resumed in the East, it was Russia not the Central Powers which took the initiative. At one time the number of German divisions in Russia was reduced to seventy.

Thus it came about that a greatly increased and unexpected burden was thrown upon the Western Allies, and in all the circumstances it was not surprising that the armies of these Powers were able to achieve only small advances during the summer.

THE ITALIAN OFFENSIVES IN MAY AND AUGUST.

The course of the war in the Italian Theatre manifested a progressive increase of power on the part of the Latin kingdom, which was not altogether dissimilar from, although less remarkable than, the progressive growth of Great Britain's military strength. In both cases military power was extended and built up in a steady manner after the outbreak of hostilities, although in the one case the initial weakness was due solely to inferior numbers and in the other case mainly to inferior armament. At the beginning of the war in May, 1915, and for more than a year afterwards the Austrians enjoyed an advantage over their new foes in geographical position, in munitions, and in every essential element of military strength with the important exception of numbers. The Italians possessed a great numerical superiority. This was, however, more than counterbalanced by the other factors, and at the beginning of June, 1916, the small but well-led and well-armed Austrian Army was on the point of carrying out an advance into the Venetian plain, which, according to all the indications, would have been dangerously successful, if it had not been suddenly paralysed at the last moment by the brilliant and formidable intervention of the Russian General Brusiloff. Later in the same summer, however, General Cadorna, the Italian Commander-in-Chief, redeemed his reputation by his brilliant victory at Gorizia : which, with the exception of the Marne, is probably to be reckoned as the most important success that the Allies had won in Western Europe up to that date. And in May, 1917, the Italians once more took the offensive in the direction of Trieste

During the winter the Italians had greatly strengthened their artillery, and in addition they were able to face the new summer campaign with the assistance of numerous British guns and gunners. The Austrians, on their side, had used the winter respite to fortify further their formidable mountain positions, and at the critical moment they were fortunate in being able to withdraw a number of divisions from the Galician Front, well knowing that the Russians would not test their weakness in that region. The new battle took place in the district where fighting occurred at the time of the capture of Gorizia. The Italian line ran southwards from Plezzo to the sea, along the left bank of the river Isonzo, the line being in some places, notably in the coastal terrain known as the Carso, 6 or 7 miles eastward of the famous river. After three days' violent artillery preparation, in which the British gunners played a con-

spicuous part, Cadorna launched a general assault on May 14 along the whole front from Tolmino to the sea. The bombardment was of such a formidable character that in spite of the enormous difficulties presented by the topography, the Italians were able to reach the advanced positions of the Austrians on nearly all sections of the line attacked. In the first three days the Italians took over 4,000 prisoners, but they captured only very few guns. The fighting was desperately severe, lines of trenches being captured and recaptured five or six times in one day. The Austrians possessed every advantage of position, in addition to that great inherent advantage which the defending side always possesses in modern warfare, and in these circumstances it was not surprising that in spite of their numerical inferiority they were able to hold their ground. The Austrians delivered vigorous counter-attacks, and on May 15 and 16 captured about 1,500 prisoners. The Italians made their most brilliant efforts in the zone between Monte Kuk and Monte Vodice, and on May 18 they captured Hill 652, the topmost peak of Monte Vodice.

On May 23 Cadorna threw forward the second wave of his great offensive, the chief effort being made this time on the extreme right wing of the Italian Army, between Kortanjevica and the sea. Hudi Log and Jamiano were captured, and 9,000 prisoners were taken in one day. The Austrian defenders were, however, reinforced by Hungarian troops from the Eastern Front, and these regiments carried out some very creditable counter-attacks, the Italians being driven back in many places and losing about 4,000 men as prisoners on May 24 and 25. On this latter day the whole line from Plava to the sea swayed to and fro repeatedly and the casualties on both sides were extremely heavy. The net result was that the Austrians maintained their general strategic line, the Italians only succeeding in capturing certain points of minor tactical importance. A feature of this battle was the spirited character of the Austrian defence, which was by no means purely passive but took the form of constant counter-attacks. The Italian assaults on the Carso lasted four days, but died down on May 27. Between May 14 and the end of that month the Italians captured forty guns, and about 25,000 prisoners, whilst in the same period the Austrians took about 13,000 prisoners. The battle continued at various points between Tolmino and the sea during the first week of June, but no essential changes in the situation were made. Whilst these operations were taking place on the eastern sector of the Italian Front, the Carinthian and Tyrolese segments of the line remained comparatively quiescent, neither side attempting to make any serious diversions in those districts.

The Italians carried out another great offensive in the same district in August, and this, which the Austrians called the "Eleventh Isonzo Battle," developed in much the same manner

as did the battle in May. On August 19, after an artillery preparation lasting about thirty-six hours, General Cadorna once more attacked along the whole of the front from Tolmino to the sea, which was about 40 miles in length. From Plava to the sea, a distance of about 25 miles, the Austrian first line was carried in the first rush, and 8,000 prisoners were taken on the first day. Northwards of Plava, up to Tolmino, the attack was less successful. The subsequent operations illustrated once more the difficulty of breaking the second and third lines of an entrenched defence, as contrasted with the vulnerability of a first line. On the second and third days 5,000 more prisoners were taken, and thirty guns fell to the Italians in the first three days. On the fourth and fifth days further progress was made, and another thirty guns and 7,000 more prisoners were captured. The contest was fiercest around the Bainsizza Plateau, the high tableland situated to the east of the Isonzo, between Loga and Vodice, and eastward of those places. The Italians swarmed across the river by means of fourteen pontoon bridges, and rushed up the western slopes of the plateau regardless of the Austrian fire. On August 24 the Italian troops stormed Monte Santo, a dominating peak on the south of the plateau, about 2 miles south-east of Vodice. This was a most remarkable feat, since Monte Santo, in addition to being a position of great natural strength, had been fortified by all the arts of modern warfare. On the plateau itself the Italians advanced no less than 4 miles on a front of 12 miles, and thus approached the eastern slopes of the tableland. After taking Monte Santo on the sixth day of the offensive, the Italians next directed their main efforts towards the capture of Monte San Gabriele, another formidable height lying to the south of Monte Santo. The Italians attacked the hill repeatedly both from the north and from the west, but the position proved too strong for them. In these assaults the Italian losses were heavy. The Austrians threw in reinforcements all along the line, and made vigorous counter-attacks, and in this way they in their turn captured thousands of prisoners. The battle continued for three weeks, but after August 24 the Italians made but little progress; on the contrary, the Austrians recaptured part of the terrain that they had lost. During the three weeks of this battle the Italians captured over 30,000 prisoners and about eighty guns. The Austrians took 18,000 prisoners. The Italians employed more than 250 aeroplanes in these operations.

THE RUSSIAN COLLAPSE IN GALICIA.

The virtual armistice which was established in the Eastern Theatre after the Russian Revolution has already been described. This state of affairs lasted for more than three months. At the end of June, however, the new Russian Government

yielded to the great pressure which the Allies and the pro-war party in Russia brought to bear upon them, and ordered the Army to resume operations and to take the offensive against the now quiescent Austro-German invaders. M. Kerensky had originally desired to obtain from all the Allies, jointly, a new declaration of war-aims before ordering the Russian Army to re-enter the war. He wished to have the Entente war-aims revised in accordance with the new Russian formula of "No Annexations and no Indemnities"; and he feared that unless the non-aggressive character of the war was made clear to the Army in some such manner as this, the revolutionary soldiery could not be relied upon to move. As the event proved, his fears were well founded; and it is clear that he was unwise from the purely military point of view to yield to the persuasions of those who were much less cognisant of the conditions in the Army than he was, although it is certainly very possible that even if new and unaggressive war-aims had been proclaimed the disciplineless soldiery would still have refused to fight.

During the whole of the first six months of the year there were no serious operations on any part of the Eastern Front. Early in January the German advance in Rumania, which had been the chief feature of the closing months of the previous year, came to a halt in the neighbourhood of the river Sereth but not before the invaders had captured Braila and Focșani two important towns on the west side of that river. After these events, neither side attempted to take the initiative in Rumania for several months. On June 29, however, the Russian Army commenced an offensive in Galicia in the neighbourhood of Brzezany. At the beginning of June, General Brusiloff had been appointed Commander-in-Chief, in succession to General Alexieff, and it was natural that the new Generalissimo should select the scene of his successes in the previous year as the sector for his new move. At first the new offensive prospered fairly well. In the first four days the Russians captured 20,000 prisoners and thirty guns. The Russians succeeded in making a considerable breach in the Austro-Hungarian line between Koniuchy and Byshki (north of Brzezany), but their losses appear to have been even heavier than is usual and inevitable in such operations. Another breach was made in the enemy's defences further north, at Zborow, the Russians employing in this district an enormous mass of troops, who advanced to the assault in twelve or more successive waves.

The greatest Russian success was gained, however, much further south, a few days later. This occurred near Stanislau the important town and railway junction near the Carpathian foot-hills which Brusiloff had captured in the previous summer. The Austro-Hungarian positions were situated a short distance to the west of the river Bystrzyca. On July 7 and 8 the Russians broke these positions along a front of 15 miles, and drove the Austrians back a distance of 8 miles, using cavalry in the

pursuit. Seven thousand prisoners were taken and fifty guns. This operation was carried out under the personal direction of General Korniloff, the Commander of the Eighth Army, who had previously been commandant of Petrograd. General Korniloff, who was a Cossack Chief, subsequently became famous in consequence of his ambitious intervention in political affairs. He was very popular with the Cossacks, but possessed little influence with the other troops. On July 10 the town of Halicz, on the Dniester, and lying therefore between Brzezany and Stanislau, was captured by Korniloff's army, and the depth of the Russian advance south of the great river increased to 15 miles. The Austro-Hungarian troops were now defending the line of the river Lomnica, a tributary stream, which flows into the Dniester at Halicz. It seemed probable, however, that their defence would be overcome, and they lost the town of Kalush, on the western bank. At this point, German troops began to arrive, and the Russians therefore had to encounter a stronger resistance. During the long informal armistice the Berlin General Staff had removed about twenty-five of their divisions from the Eastern Front, but they now began to pass these army-corps back to the threatened points between the Pripet and the Carpathians. Korniloff was thus compelled after three days' severe fighting to evacuate Kalush and to retire to the east bank of the Lomnica, where, however, he showed himself able to hold his ground.

It was at this point in the battle that the catastrophe occurred. The war-spirit of many of the Russian divisions had been undermined by the propaganda of the extreme Socialists, and at the critical moment certain regiments near Zborow refused to go into battle. The infection spread, and the German Commanders seeing their opportunity, broke through the Russian line at this spot, and marched rapidly along the railway from Lemberg to Tarnopol. Chaos ensued in the Russian ranks. The artillery and the cavalry remained staunch—most of the cavalry being, of course, Cossacks—and the officers of the infantry did their utmost to control their men, but the rank and file had no spirit for the fight and no discipline, and they fled in hordes. The break on the roads to Tarnopol necessitated a retreat farther south. Halicz was retaken by the Germans on July 23. M Kerensky, who had just become Prime Minister, immediately appointed General Korniloff as Commander of the entire "South-Western Front," from the Pripet to Rumania, but even Korniloff could not stop the panic. Korniloff's predecessor in this post, General Gator, was in no way responsible for the disaster, which was wholly due to insubordination.

After this the Austro-German advance was almost unopposed in many places, and the enemy rapidly recovered not only the small territory which he had lost earlier in July, but also much of the large area which General Brusiloff had conquered in 1916. The Russian soldiers deserted in tens of thousands.

In the words of the Army Committee of the South-Western Front (a new democratic body), what happened was as follows: "Some elements voluntarily evacuate their positions without even waiting for the approach of the enemy. Cases are on record in which an order given to proceed with all haste to such-and-such a spot to assist comrades in distress has been discussed for several hours at meetings, and the reinforcements were consequently delayed. These elements, at the first shots fired by the enemy, abandon their positions. For a distance of several hundred versts long files of deserters, both armed and unarmed, men who are in good health and robust, who have lost all shame and feel that they can act altogether with impunity, are proceeding to the rear of the army. Frequently entire units desert in this manner." Orders were given to fire on these deserters, but as in many places they were not only armed but in a large majority, the loyal troops were often overpowered, and in many instances whole batteries of artillery-men were slaughtered by the flying infantry. Even an appeal by the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates had little or no effect.

On July 24, General Bohm-Ermoli's troops entered Stanislau and Tarnopol, the latter being an important town on the main railway from Lemberg to Odessa, which the Russians had held ever since their first advance in September, 1914, even through the great disasters of 1915. Buczacz, Delatyn, and Kolomea then fell in quick succession. By July 28 the Austro-German forces reached the frontier at Husiatyn, and thus virtually the whole of Galicia was cleared of Russian troops, the Germans therefore advancing even farther in this direction than they did in 1915. Meantime the Rumanians created quite a serious diversion on their front farther south, and with the help of the local Russian contingents captured sixty Austrian guns, and several thousands of prisoners; but the gallant Rumanian Army was too weak numerically to counter-act the gigantic Russian defection. From the date when the Austro-German forces took the offensive seriously at Zborow, July 19, to the end of the month they advanced over 60 miles. The whole of Bukovina was reconquered early in August, and the Austrians re-entered Czernovitz (which thus changed hands for the sixth time) on the third of that month. At the same time General Korniloff succeeded General Brusiloff as Commander-in-Chief. During the second half of July and the first half of August the Austro-German forces captured about 200 guns and about 20,000 prisoners from the Russians, and also numerous prisoners and about fifty guns from the Rumanians.

THE OPERATIONS IN THE WEST.

The Franco-British Front was the scene of much the largest military operations of the summer, and for the first time

since the Marne this theatre took precedence decidedly of the Russian Front. The Central Powers now employed a larger number of divisions against the Franco-British Front than against the Russo-Rumanian Front. And since all the troops in the West were German, their average quality was doubtless higher than that of the mixed German, Austrian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Turkish corps which confronted the disorderly Muscovites and their immediate Allies. Moreover, the divisions in the West were more plentifully supplied with artillery. The information available appeared to show that during the summer of 1917 the German field army consisted of about 240 divisions, of which nearly 170 were stationed in the West during the period of the informal Russian armistice, that is, from the end of March to the end of June. Of these 170 divisions, nearly seventy were stationed over against the British, and over seventy faced the French, the remainder being held as a general strategic reserve. The British Front was still less than one-third that of the entire Western line, but as these figures show, the concentration against the British was, relatively, very much greater than that against the French—so much so, that the now huge British Expeditionary Force confronted nearly half the German force in the West, and approximately one-third of the entire German Army. This fact makes it possible to realise the amazing growth of the British Field Army, which at the beginning of the campaign, less than three years before, consisted of only seven divisions. Although the Western Front had thus come to possess paramount importance, it must be confessed that its interest for British readers resides chiefly in the fact that it was the scene of the activities of the main British Army. The strategic interest is less than that inherent in the events which occurred in other theatres. The reason of this is that on the Western Front the extraordinary state of deadlock was never broken throughout the summer. The rigidity of the opposing lines was as complete as in 1915 and 1916. After the one great German retreat in March, no similar movement occurred. The so-called "Hindenburg Line" of fortifications which was established, was subsequently indented by the Franco-British attacks, and its defenders were fearfully punished by artillery, but it was not broken. Hence the actual advances which were achieved covered only a small area of country.

After the Battle of Arras and the unsuccessful French offensive in April there was a lull in the fighting, and the British captures of prisoners during May were small and only one gun was taken. At the beginning of June, however, the British opened a new offensive, which was carried out with even greater vigour than was displayed in the Battle of Arras. The new operations received the name of the Battle of Messines. To the west of the small town of Messines the ground rises to a ridge, a long low hill, which the Germans then held, and from

which their guns commanded much of the British Front south of Ypres. It was this ridge which was the immediate objective of the assault. North-west of Messines the German line, as it existed at the beginning of June, formed a marked salient, and ran westward of Wytschaete. After a violent artillery preparation lasting for several days, the infantry of the British "Second Army" moved to the assault at 3 a.m. on June 7. The attack extended over a front of 9 miles from Klein Zillebeke, just north of the Ypres-Comines Canal, to a point situated about a mile south of Messines village. The Second Army was under the command of General Plumer. The attack upon the ridge was preceded by the explosion of twenty enormous mines, upon the preparation of which months had been spent. The sound of this explosion was heard in the outskirts of London. The German defence was literally blown to pieces. The whole of the contested ridge was captured in the first rush of the infantry. The villages of Wytschaete, Messines, Oosttaverne, Hollebeke, and Klein Zillebeke were also captured. Five thousand prisoners were taken on this one day, but the number of guns which fell to the British was not large. The advance reached a maximum depth of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles. In the course of the next week the Crown Prince of Bavaria, who commanded the troops on the British Front, launched a series of violent counter-attacks, but all his attempts to retake the ridge were successfully frustrated. During the remainder of June the British made further slight advances, and by the end of the month the toll of captures increased to sixty-seven guns and nearly 9,000 prisoners. It will be noted that these figures are not so large as those relating to the Battle of Arras. It may be mentioned that in their counter-attacks during April and May the Germans took about 6,000 prisoners from the British.

The next action which has to be mentioned is one in which the Germans took the initiative. This took place at Nieuport, close to the Belgian coast. The British line in this locality lay on the east side of the river Yser. On July 9 the Germans opened a violent bombardment of the British positions seawards of Nieuport, and on the evening of the 10th, having destroyed the bridges across the Yser by this gunfire, they attacked the English contingent stationed on the right bank, who were now isolated by the river in their rear. The troops caught in this predicament were battalions of the Northamptonshires and the King's Royal Rifles. The English inevitably suffered severe casualties, and the Germans claimed to have captured nearly 1,300 prisoners. The ground on the east bank of the Yser was lost, and the enemy achieved an advance of 600 yards on a front of 1,400 yards. When the attacking troops, who were Marines, overwhelmed the defence by weight of numbers, the staff of the King's Royal Rifles sought no quarter, but fought to the death with their revolvers.

The next offensive was carried out by the British with some

assistance from the French, and was known as the "Third Battle of Ypres." During the last ten days of July the bombardment of the German line in Flanders was increased to a pitch of extreme violence, and according to the German account, the artillery duel on this occasion exceeded in intensity anything previously witnessed. After the bombardment the infantry went to the attack on July 31, a small contingent of French troops making a joint attack and operating on the British left wing, close to the sea. The new offensive suffered the same fate as the other great attacks in the Western Theatre. Advances were made in the initial stages only: the opposing lines were driven back a short distance, but were not broken. The attack extended over a front of 15 miles, from Steenstraate on the river Yser to La Basse Ville on the river Lys. The French contingent captured Steenstraate and Bixschoote, and drove back the German lines to a depth of about 2 miles. This advance was achieved in the first rush, on the morning of July 31, and the British advances further south were likewise made on the first day. The British captured the villages of Verlorenhoek, Frezenberg, St Julien, and Pilken in the centre, and the villages of Hooge, Westhoek, La Basse Ville, and Hollebeke on the right wing. The British took over 5,000 prisoners on July 31, and the French captured about 1,000. The German counter-attacks were prompt and determined, and throughout the night of July 31-August 1 they endeavoured to recapture the ground that they had lost, the German commanders hoping to seize the disputed terrain before the British had had time to consolidate their positions upon it. In this, however, the enemy were frustrated; on August 1 the Germans did, indeed, succeed in recapturing St Julien, but they obtained no appreciable advantage at any other spot, and the British once more entered St. Julien two days later.

During the next fortnight the fighting on the British Front was less severe, but on August 15 Sir Douglas Haig again took the offensive. On this day Canadian troops delivered a successful assault upon a dominating height known as Hill 70, near Lens, and on the following day the village of Langemarck, north-east of Ypres, was taken. During these two days about 2,500 prisoners were captured, and a few guns also fell into the hands of the British.

These operations were followed by a diversion by the French on the famous battle-field of Verdun. After some artillery preparation they opened a relatively small offensive on August 20, and on that and the following day they captured Avocourt Wood, two summits of Mort Homme, Cumières Wood, Samogneux, and other points, over 6,000 prisoners also being captured in the advance.

It is of interest to note that the total number of prisoners taken by the British in these offensives, that is, from July 31 to August 31, both inclusive, was 10,697, and about forty guns were captured.

THE WAR AT SEA.

The most remarkable feature in the naval conflict was once more the fact that it was almost limited to the submarine sphere. The British supremacy in the oversea sphere went unchallenged. The Germans made no attempt to repeat the experiment which they made at the Battle of Jutland, that episode having been very costly to them. Nevertheless, the oversea war should not be forgotten. The British Battle-Fleet, through its very existence and its awe-inspiring might, not only preserved the British Isles free from invasion, but was instrumental in isolating Central Europe from the outer world, thus preventing almost completely the importation into Germany of all manner of raw materials of which she was in sore need, and in the absence of which her great army was severely hampered. British naval supremacy remained the foundation, and the only and indispensable foundation of the Entente's power.

Of the oversea warfare, therefore, all that has to be told is a series of minor and disconnected incidents. These may be mentioned in chronological order, the destruction of merchantmen by the German submarines being dealt with separately. On January 12 the following announcement by the Admiralty was published:—

“H.M.S. *Cornwallis* (Captain A. P. Davidson, D.S.O.) was sunk by enemy submarine on January 9 in the Mediterranean. The Captain and all the officers are saved, but there are 13 men missing. It is feared that they were killed by the explosion.

“H.M. Seaplane-Carrier *Ben-My-Chree* (Wing Commander C. R. Samson, D.S.O.) was sunk by gunfire in Kastelorizo Harbour (Asia Minor) on January 11. The only casualties were one officer and four men wounded.”

The battleship *Cornwallis* which was thus reported sunk was commissioned in 1904, and had a displacement of 14,000 tons. The *Ben-My-Chree* was a converted passenger steamer of 2,550 tons.

On January 31 the British Government caused to be published a notification which had been sent to the American and other neutral Governments describing a new minefield which had been laid down in the North Sea. The following area was thus described as “dangerous to shipping”:—

“The area comprising all the waters, except the Netherlands and Danish territorial waters, lying south-westward and eastward of a line commencing 4 miles from the coast of Jutland in latitude 56° N., longitude 8° E., and passing through the following positions: Latitude 56° N., longitude 6° E., latitude 54° N., longitude 0° 45' E., thence to a position in latitude 53° 37' N., longitude 5° E., 7 miles off the coast of the Netherlands.”

The existence of this new minefield had the effect of block-

ing the approaches to the German coast, save, of course, for the channel running down Danish territorial waters.

On March 19 the French battleship *Danton* was torpedoed and sunk in the Mediterranean by a hostile submarine, presumably Austro-Hungarian. Most of the crew were saved by a torpedo-boat-destroyer, but 296 were lost. This vessel was one of the finest battleships in the French Navy, being a "Dreadnought" of 18,000 tons.

At the end of 1916 and during the first ten or eleven weeks of 1917 some remarkable exploits were performed by the German auxiliary cruiser *Mowe*, which got out into the Atlantic in spite of the British blockade, and having done a large amount of damage, again eluded the British patrols, and returned safely to Germany in March. This ship was capable of adopting several disguises by means of removable masts and dummy funnels. Nearly twenty British ships were sunk by the raider, this representing a loss of about 100,000 tons. A few allied and neutral ships were also sunk. The cruiser made her way outwards and inwards by steaming far north and round by the Newfoundland coasts. She reached the South Atlantic, however, and at one time lay off Capetown, and at another cruised in the vicinity of Rio de Janeiro. The officer in charge of the *Mowe* was Commander Count Dohna-Schlodien.

On the night of April 20-21 six German destroyers carried out a raid on Dover, but were driven off with serious losses by British destroyers. The Vice-Admiral at Dover reported the episode as follows:—

"On the night of the 20th-21st five German destroyers attempted a raid on Dover. The raid resulted in their firing a number of rounds into a ploughed field a few miles distant from Dover. The enemy appears then to have steered in the direction of some of our shipping, possibly with the intention of attacking, but was met by two vessels of the Dover Patrol. In five minutes these two vessels engaged and sank at least two, and possibly three, out of the five enemy boats, the remainder making off at high speed during the short engagement and escaping in the darkness.

"Our vessels suffered no material damage, and our casualties were exceedingly slight in comparison with the results obtained. Our patrol vessels were handled with remarkable gallantry and dash, and the tactics pursued were a very fine example of destroyer work. We were fortunate in being able to save the lives of ten German officers and ninety-five men from the vessels which were sunk."

The authorities announced later that thirteen more German seamen had been saved, and it subsequently transpired that the German squadron had consisted of six vessels, not five. The British warships engaged were two large destroyers, or "destroyer-leaders," the *Swift* and the *Broke*, commanded by Commander Ambrose M. Peck, and Commander R. G. R.

Evans (the famous Antarctic explorer) respectively. During the fight the *Broke* rammed the third vessel in the enemy line, and the two boats became locked together. The crew of the German then boarded the *Broke* and hand-to-hand fighting ensued. The boarders were driven over the side, and a minute later the *Broke* wrenched herself free from the rammed destroyer, which quickly sank. The second German ship which was lost appears to have been sunk by a torpedo.

A few days later another squadron of German destroyers raided the English coast. This occurred on the night of April 26-27, and the town of Ramsgate was subjected to a rather severe bombardment for a few minutes, three persons being killed and three wounded, and a couple of dozen buildings being damaged.

During April and May several British troopships were torpedoed and sunk by hostile submarines. On April 15 the transport *Arcadian*, a large vessel of nearly 9,000 tons, was torpedoed in the Eastern Mediterranean, and sank in a few minutes. The losses included 19 officers, 214 soldiers, 54 seamen, and 2 civilians. On April 25 the transport *Ballarat*, carrying a large number of Australian troops, was sunk in the same manner, but on this occasion there was no loss of life, owing to the excellent discipline preserved, and also, evidently, to the fact that the ship did not sink so rapidly as the *Arcadian*. On May 4 the transport *Transylvania* was torpedoed in the Mediterranean, and sank. The losses on this occasion included 29 officers, 373 soldiers, the captain of the ship (Lieut. S. Brenell, R N R.), and 1 officer and 9 men of the crew.

On the morning of May 15 a small action was fought in the Adriatic between Austro-Hungarian warships and various British, French, and Italian vessels. A squadron of hostile light cruisers and destroyers issued forth from Cattaro under cover of darkness, and surprised an Italian convoy, and British and Italian patrol-boats off Otranto. Fourteen British patrol-boats or "drifters" were rapidly sunk by gunfire, and half a dozen Italian patrol-boats, an Italian steamer, and an Italian torpedo-boat were also lost. The Austro-Hungarian vessels picked up 72 British seamen from the sunken drifters. Two British cruisers, the *Dartmouth* and the *Bristol*, and British, French, and Italian destroyers then appeared on the scene, whereupon the enemy beat a hasty retreat to Cattaro, pursued by the Allied forces. According to the Austrian report, Entente submarines were also engaged. Several of the hostile ships were damaged by gunfire during the pursuit, but none was sunk. Whilst returning from Cattaro the *Dartmouth* was torpedoed by a German submarine, which had been lying in wait, but the cruiser did not sink, and was able to reach port.

During the passage of the first American Expeditionary Force to Europe in June, two attacks were made upon the transports by German ocean-going submarines. The attacks

were made far out in the Atlantic. On both occasions the submarines were driven off by the American destroyers which were escorting the troopships, and the Americans suffered no losses. The first engagement took place on the night of June 22 and the second occurred a few days later. The first attack was made so far west that the escort had not been reinforced by the American destroyer fleet then operating in European waters, but on the second occasion, when a different, and of course a later convoy was involved, these Eastern squadrons were present. In both engagements some damage appeared to have been done to the submarines, and in the second fight one German vessel was certainly sunk.

On July 6 a British destroyer was torpedoed and sunk by a submarine in the North Sea, with the loss of one officer and seven men killed.

A serious disaster, accompanied by terrible loss of life, occurred to the British Fleet on the night of July 9. The battleship *Vanguard* blew up whilst at anchor owing to an internal explosion, and sank immediately. Fortunately some of the men and a third of the officers were not on board at the time, but of those who were on board, all the officers (to the number of thirty-eight) and all the men except two were killed.

On July 16 British destroyers sighted six German merchantmen slinking up the Netherlands coast between Egmond and Bergen. The ships were ordered to stop, but refused to do so. Two escaped into Netherlands territorial waters, but the other four were captured and were brought safely into a British port. The prizes were small vessels ranging from 1,088 tons to 1,495 tons.

In February it was made known that the German Government proposed to abandon the hitherto universal practice of respecting the immunity from attack conferred upon hospital ships by the Hague Convention for the Adaptation of the Principles of the Geneva Convention to maritime war. The German Government stated that "traffic of hospital ships on the military routes for the forces fighting in France and Belgium, within a line drawn between Flamborough Head and Terschelling on the one hand, and from Ushant and Land's End on the other, will no longer be tolerated." The German excuse for this new departure from the recognised canons of warfare was that British and French "hospital ships had often been misused for the transport of munitions and troops." The British Government promptly denied that there was any truth in this allegation. The German Government stated that the British and French authorities had been given the proofs of the charge through neutral diplomatic channels, but the British stated that the alleged proofs had never been received. The German Government proceeded to carry out their threat, and several hospital ships were actually torpedoed and sunk in the most ruthless manner, without even a warning being given. For-

tunately, however, this did not continue for long. Through the good offices of the King of Spain's Government an agreement was reached between the British and German Governments by the terms of which a Spanish officer should travel on each hospital ship, and should guarantee that the ship was being used only for legitimate hospital purposes. This agreement was put into effect during the summer, and the British were thereby saved from the necessity, which would otherwise have arisen, of establishing new hospitals on the Continent on a very large scale.

As already indicated the submarine campaign remained the most important part of the war at sea, and the following statistics, drawn up for comparison with those given in Chapter I., will show the fluctuations of this contest during the summer.—

Month	Arrivals at U K Ports	Sailings from U K Ports	Sunk Over 1,600 Tons	Sunk Under 1,600 Tons	British Ships Unsuccessfully Attacked by Submarines
May (4 weeks) - -	10,825	10,578	75	38	81
June (5 weeks) - -	13,978	14,226	101	29	105
July (4 weeks) - -	11,264	11,285	68	13	55
August (5 weeks) - -	13,300	13,338	88	16	49

It will be noticed that a total of 428 British merchant vessels (exclusive of fishing craft) was sunk during the four months, the figures being closely comparable to those for the month of March, and much less bad than the statistics for April, which remained by far the blackest month for the British (see Chapter I.). If the average size of the ships lost was 3,000 tons, the average loss per month would be only about 320,000 tons, a total which, though quite sufficiently serious, was undoubtedly much below the expectations of the German Naval Staff when they rashly provoked war with America, and also below what was feared in Entente countries when the unrestricted submarine campaign began. The British Navy, assisted by large squadrons of American destroyers which arrived in the Eastern Atlantic in May, proved able to reduce and confine the depredations of the German submarines, although not able to extinguish the menace completely. The question of the aggregate tonnage lost is dealt with more fully in Chapter III.

THE WAR IN THE AIR.

The war in the air continued to expand during 1917, nothing being more remarkable than the immense increase in the scale of aerial operations as time passed. The number of aeroplanes employed, by both alliances, in 1917 was enormously greater

than the number in use at the beginning of the war. Aerial activity was, as might be expected, most intense on the Western Front, but large numbers of aeroplanes were also used in the other theatres. In respect of the heavier-than-air machines the Entente held a certain advantage over the Central Powers, a superiority which was chiefly of a numerical character, but in the matter of lighter-than-air craft Germany still led the world. The Allies, however, did not neglect airships, and the British, in particular, built a considerable number of these wonderful vessels, which they used for patrolling the coast, and for scouting for submarines. It was found that a submarine, especially when completely submerged, could be detected much more easily from an airship than from a ship on the sea. The Germans continued to use their Zeppelin airships occasionally for long-distance raids upon England. Owing to the expansion of aerial operations it is only possible this year to narrate the more important episodes which occurred.

During the night of March 16 Zeppelin airships made a raid upon Kent, but no serious damage was done.

On April 21 a British airship, which was patrolling the East coast, was driven out of its course and carried by the wind towards Belgium. German aeroplanes issued forth from the neighbourhood of Ostend, and attacked the ship, which was hit and fell in flames in the Straits of Dover. All the crew were lost.

A remarkable incident occurred on May 1. A squadron of German seaplanes attacked some British merchant vessels near the south-east coast of England, and the steamer *Gena* was hit by a torpedo discharged from one of these seaplanes, though not before she had brought down another unit of the hostile squadron. The *Gena* sank off Aldeburgh, Suffolk, her crew being rescued by a British ship.

On May 14 British warships shot down a Zeppelin, the "L 22," in the North Sea.

On the night of May 23 a squadron of four or five Zeppelins crossed the East coast of England, and cruised over East Anglia for a considerable time. They dropped bombs, but little damage was done.

In the afternoon of May 25 a serious raid was made upon Kent by a large squadron of German aeroplanes, to the number of sixteen or seventeen machines. The attack occurred between 5 o'clock and 6.30. Bombs were dropped on a number of localities, but the most serious damage was done at Folkestone, where most of the casualties occurred. More than 150 persons, including many women and children, were killed or wounded. Some of the bombs fell in crowded streets, and a number of shops were wrecked. Three of the raiders were brought down on their way back to Belgium by the Royal Naval Air Service.

On June 5 another large squadron of German aeroplanes, again consisting of about sixteen machines, attacked the defences

of the Medway. Many bombs were dropped, and considerable injury was done to private buildings, but the damage done to Naval and Military establishments was slight, and the casualties were few. The raiding squadron lost two machines.

On June 13 another squadron of German aeroplanes, again about fifteen in number, crossed the English coast, and succeeded in reaching London and bombing the capital in broad daylight. The aeroplanes, which separated on their way to London, reached the outskirts of the metropolis at about 11.30 and flew over the London area for about a quarter of an hour. Many bombs were dropped, most of them falling on the East End. A distressing incident was that one bomb fell on a Public Elementary School in the East End, killing 16 small children, and injuring over 100 others. Altogether 157 persons were killed, and 150 were seriously injured. The German aeroplanes flew at a great height and none was destroyed.

On June 14 British warships shot down a Zeppelin, the "L 43," in the North Sea.

Early on June 17 two Zeppelins raided the English coast, one attacking Kent and the other East Anglia. A few casualties were caused in Kent, but the ship attempting to raid East Anglia was brought down and destroyed by a British aviator.

Another daring attack was made upon London by a squadron of over twenty German aeroplanes at about 10 A.M. on July 7. Bombs were dropped both on London and in Thanet. The hostile machines did not fly so high as on June 13, but only one was shot down over England although three were subsequently destroyed at sea by the Royal Naval Air Service. The aeroplanes were able to maintain their correct squadron-formation during the greater part of the raid. The casualties included 43 persons killed and 197 injured.

On August 22 ten aeroplanes raided the coast of Kent, and bombed Margate, Ramsgate, and Dover. No damage was done at Margate, but at Ramsgate and Dover 11 persons were killed and 13 injured. Three of the raiders were brought down.

THE FALL OF RIGA

At the end of August the Germans took advantage of the demoralisation of the Russian Army to revive their project of capturing the great Baltic port of Riga—the fifth city of the Russian Empire. Marshal von Hindenburg had made an effort to take the town at the end of the summer campaign of 1915, but he had then failed to make any serious breach in its defences. On this occasion, however, the Germans met with only a feeble resistance. The attack began along the lower reaches of the River Aa, the invaders advancing along the great road from Mitau. The assault in this district began on August 22, and ten days later the Germans forced a passage of the Dvina at Uexküll, 18 miles above Riga. The converging columns advanced

rapidly, and the vanguard of the army coming up the road from Windau, which was commanded by General von Hutier, entered the town on September 3. On the following day Dunamunde was occupied, and the Russians fled with all speed across the Jaegel and far away into the wild hill-country to the north-east. The line of the Dvina (Duna) was abandoned as far as the neighbourhood of Kokenhusen (a place 10 miles above Friedrickstadt), but the Russians retained possession of Dunaburg. During these operations the Germans captured 316 guns and about 8,000 prisoners. Riga was somewhat severely damaged by the bombardment, and many parts of the town were on fire when the Germans arrived. The normal population of the town was nearly 600,000, but many thousands of civilians fled when the fall of the city became imminent, and, indeed, many of the inhabitants had departed at the time of the original German advance in 1915.

Throughout its history Riga has been a predominantly German town, and was a leading city of the Hansa League. About half the populace spoke German as their mother-tongue, but the poorer classes included many Letts, and a number of Muscovite officials and their families had settled in the city since the annexation to the Russian Empire.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE FALL OF RIGA TO THE END OF THE YEAR.

THE WESTERN FRONT.

ALTHOUGH no large geographical changes were brought about, extremely heavy fighting took place in the Western Theatre during the last four months of the year. The Allies had the initiative throughout, and it was invariably they who took the offensive, although the German defence remained powerful and vigorous. By means of very heavy bombardments and desperately hard fighting, the British pressed back the Germans for short distances along the front east of Ypres. On September 20 assaults were delivered along the Ypres-Menin road, and in the successful though limited advance over 2,000 prisoners were captured. The village of Veldhoek was rushed, and on September 21, 1,000 more prisoners were taken. During the next few days the Germans made several powerful counter-attacks, but the British held their new positions. In the month of September the British captured 5,296 German prisoners and eleven guns, and in October they similarly captured 9,125 prisoners and fifteen guns. On November 6 another assault was delivered east of Ypres, this time a short distance north of the Menin road, and the village of Passchendaele was stormed by Canadian troops. Passchendaele stands on relatively high ground, and

therefore after its capture the British artillery commanded much of the country to the north-east and east

On October 23 the French executed an offensive on the Aisne section of their front, from the Vauxaillon district to La Rozére. The German line was pressed back on a front of six miles and to a depth of two miles, and Allemant, Vaudesson, Chavignon, and Malmaison Fort were captured. About 8,000 prisoners and twenty-five guns were captured.

At the beginning of November, after the disastrous Italian collapse on the Isonzo, a conference between leading members of the three Western Governments was held at Rapallo, and it was announced on November 10 that a permanent Allied Council would be constituted for the purpose of co-ordinating operations on the Western and Italian Fronts. It was stated that the Council would consist of the Prime Minister and another member of the Cabinet of each Power, and that the Council would be advised by a military committee. This military committee was to include General Foch (France), General Sir Henry Wilson (Great Britain), and General Cadorna (Italy). General Diaz was made Commander-in-Chief of the Italian Army in succession to General Cadorna.

On November 20 the British "Third Army" under General Sir Julian Byng opened what was the most important battle of the autumn on the Western Front. The great attacks were made between St. Quentin and the river Scarpe, in the direction of Cambrai. The advance was made upon a new plan. There was no artillery preparation, but the assault of the infantry was preceded by an advance by a whole fleet of the armoured machines known as "tanks." The tanks crushed a way through the Germans' wire entanglements, and the infantry, together with cavalry detachments, rushed through the great gaps thus made. The German line was smashed on a front of ten miles, and the British penetrated to a depth of about five miles. 8,000 prisoners were taken on the first day, and in the next few days another 2,000 were captured, and 100 guns fell into the hands of the British. Numerous villages were conquered, including Graincourt and Marcoing, and on one sector the new British line reached a spot only two and a half miles from Cambrai. On November 30, however, the Germans delivered a counter-attack in great force, and reconquered a part—but only a part—of the terrain which they had lost. They claimed to have captured 4,000 prisoners and sixty guns in this counter-attack. The British captured 11,551 prisoners and 138 guns during the month of November.

Up to the end of the year the American Army played no serious part in active operations. General Pershing, Commander-in-Chief of the United States Expeditionary Force, arrived in London on June 8, and the first American battalion reached France on June 25. On October 27 it was rumoured that several battalions had entered certain first line trenches on the

French Front, and on November 5 it was announced that three Americans had been killed.

THE INVASION OF ITALY.

The Italian Theatre was the scene of the most important military events of the autumn. It will be remembered that save for a few weeks in May, 1916, the Italian Army had possessed the initiative throughout the war, and in its offensive operations had won a number of minor successes and one important victory—the capture of Gorizia. The Austrians had acted upon the defensive, and aided by topographical advantages they had maintained their ground with tolerable success, in spite of their inferior numbers. The strength of the Austrian Army in this region had never exceeded half a million bayonets, and had often remained for months as low as 300,000 men. On the one occasion when the Austrians had taken the offensive, in May, 1916, they had displayed a significant superiority, for that advance upon Vicenza was defeated not by the Italian defence itself, but by the highly opportune intervention of Italy's great ally in the East.

The German Army, as such, played no part in these operations until October, 1917. A number of German volunteers had been permitted to enrol in the Austrian Army facing Italy, even before Italy and Germany were actually at war with each other, but no entire German corps took part in the fighting, and the German General Staff had no authority in the matter. When it was realised in the spring that the offensive spirit of the Russian Army had evaporated, many observers expected that the Central Powers would take the opportunity to strike at Italy, as being the weakest of their three adversaries in the West; and, indeed, it was rumoured more than once that such a blow was about to fall. But all through the summer nothing happened. It may be that the scheme was actually on foot, but was thwarted, or, rather, caused to be postponed, by General Gator's offensive at the end of June. However this may have been, the Central Powers did not move until October. The preparations for the attack were then made with extraordinary stealth, and when the blow fell, it came with amazing suddenness and with all the elements of a surprise.

In the spring the Emperor Charles accepted the resignation of the Chief-of-the-General-Staff, General Conrad von Hoetzendorf, and appointed General Arz von Strauszenberg to that position. It had long been notorious that Hoetzendorf wished to have a command against Italy; he had made a special study of the South Tyrolean terrain, and he was thereafter given command of the army guarding that part of the front. He had harboured plans for the invasion of Italy, and was anxious to gain the objectives which, as Chief-of-the-General-Staff, he had so nearly attained in May, 1916. The Austrians waited

another six months, however, and when at last they moved, the chief assault was not delivered on Hoetendorf's part of the front, but farther east. It was stated, however, that Hoetendorf played a prominent part in planning the great attack.

Early in October German and Austro-Hungarian divisions were withdrawn from the east, and were concentrated in the south-west. These troops were not sent either into the front line or into the ordinary reserve positions; they were held back, in positions many miles behind the front, and their presence remained unknown to the Italian commanders. The German reinforcements were not numerous, and do not seem to have exceeded four army corps. They were, however, picked troops, Brandenburgers, Bavarians, and others, and they were under the command of General Otto von Below, a distinguished strategist. Von Below's force was concentrated behind the Plezzo-Tolmino Front. The Austro-Hungarian reinforcements were stationed further south, behind the line running from Tolmino to the Adriatic, and they were reported to have consisted of four or five army corps. The line of the Isonzo, which was the sector on which the Italians had so often taken the offensive, was now, therefore, chosen by the Austrians in their turn as a district suitable for a great attack. It was rumoured at the time that Marshal von Mackensen was in command of these operations, but the statement appears to have rested upon surmise. The reports issued from Berlin and Vienna announced that the offensive was prepared under the personal supervision of the Emperor Charles.

The great success which attended the offensive was due to the force and rapidity of the first blow. Throughout October new guns were brought up to the Tolmino sector. They were moved at night and along specially built sunken roads, and they were consequently not observed by the Italian airmen. Until the appointed day not one of these new guns was fired. The strength of the Austrian artillery on the Tolmino Front was doubled without the Italians becoming aware of the fact. When all was ready a suitable opportunity for a surprise attack was awaited.

The night of October 23-24 was dark and foggy. The Italian "Second Army" on the Upper Isonzo was suspecting nothing unusual, and was thinking only of the day when the advance upon Trieste should be renewed. Suddenly the troops guarding the pass leading down to Caporetto found themselves under a storm of shells, including shells emitting a new kind of poisonous gas. The bombardment was violent but very short, and before the Italian troops had recovered from their surprise the German infantry, pouring down the pass at an extraordinary speed, were among them. The Italians were bayoneted in hundreds, and the remainder of the troops at this point fled in panic.

Equal success was obtained further south, at Tolmino. At

this point the Austrians had never been driven from the west bank of the Isonzo, and they were thus favourably placed for an assault. The troops operating at Tolmino were Austro-Hungarian, and they broke through the Italian lines in their first rush. The defences being ruptured at Caporetto and at Tolmino, the whole Italian line from Plezzo to Tolmino collapsed in twenty-four hours. It was not a retreat but a disastrous rout which then ensued. Guns were abandoned in hundreds, and impedimenta of all kinds fell into the hands of the victors. On the fourth day, October 27, von Below entered Cividale.

The great "break-through" which was thus achieved was the most startling event of the kind which had happened on any front since the commencement of trench warfare: for although Austro-German troops had often broken through the fortified lines of the Russians on a great scale, in these instances the defenders had been deplorably short of ammunition; and, similarly, when the Russians broke the Austro-Hungarian lines in 1916, they possessed a vast numerical superiority. In this case the defenders were thoroughly provided with guns and ammunition, and probably remained, even after the hostile reinforcements had arrived, superior in numbers. General Cadorna, by way of explaining this defeat, issued a statement that the collapse was due to "the feeble resistance of some units forming our Second Army." It was alleged that the morale of the Second Army had been undermined by traitorous pacifist propaganda. Whatever truth there may have been in this explanation, the chief cause of the defeat was that the Austro-Germans had been successful in their attempt to attack by surprise. It was the element of surprise which was the crucial factor.

This defeat involved a prolonged and disastrous retreat. The troops to the south, the Italian "Third Army," occupying the Bainsizza Plateau, Gorizia, and the Carso, were obliged to fall back in accordance with the retirement in the north. Gorizia was evacuated on October 28, and as early as that date the Austro-German commanders claimed to have taken 100,000 prisoners and 700 guns. On October 29 the town of Udine, which had hitherto been the seat of the Italian Main Headquarters, was captured by the Austrians. The Third Army retreated in good order and was able to save nearly all its artillery, and the British guns (which were with the Third Army, not with the Second Army) were also saved. After the fall of Udine the Entente public hoped that the Italian Armies would be able to defend the line of the river Tagliamento, but this proved impracticable. At Latisana, about the lower reaches of the river, the rearguard of the Second Army, consisting of 60,000 men, was cut off by von Below's rapid advance from the north-east, and being surrounded, this force surrendered without further resistance. This episode increased the losses of guns to 1,500. On November 5, after a pause lasting several days,

General Boroevic's army (the large and purely Austro-Hungarian Army operating on von Below's left) forced a passage of the Tagliamento near Pinzano, a place situated about forty miles from the mouth of the river. The Livenza was crossed three days later, large bodies of Italian troops surrendering every day. By November 8 the Austro-German Armies had captured no fewer than 2,300 guns, and a quarter of a million men. The losses in guns could be paralleled only by those incurred by the Russians in the campaign of 1915. The pursuit continued, and an attack was made concurrently upon the Tyrolese Front, the town of Asiago falling to the Austrians on November 10. After reaching the line of the river Piave, however, the Italians, aided by the wintry weather which set in, were able to hold their ground. During the next six weeks the Austrians delivered numerous attacks, both along the Piave and near Asiago, where Hoetzendorf was in command, but at the end of the year the Italians were still holding the line of the Piave. After the disaster on the Isonzo, French and British troops were hastily dispatched to the assistance of Italy, and on December 10 it was announced that French and British forces were in the firing line on the Italian Front. The British were stationed near Montello, a critical point in the new defensive system.

THE WAR AT SEA.

During the last four months of the year the submarine warfare again attracted much more attention than the operations of the surface warships, and was indeed much more eventful. It should not be forgotten, however, that the British blockade of Germany continued unceasingly, and exercised an influence on the development of the war which was quite as great as the influence of the German submarines, although the British blockade being unchallenged, or almost unchallenged, did not present itself as a visible maritime struggle.

The statements on losses from mines and submarines which the British Government issued during the last four months of the year may be tabulated for comparison with the statistics given in Chapters I and II.

Month	Arrivals at United Kingdom Ports	Sailings from United Kingdom Ports	Sunk Over 1,600 Tons	Sunk Under 1,600 Tons	British Ships Unsuccessfully Attacked by Submarines
September (4 weeks)	10,894	11,038	42	31	41
October (5 weeks)	11,960	12,115	65	23	24
November (4 weeks)	8,888	9,025	41	20	28
December (4 weeks)	9,309	9,417	55	14	37

It will be seen that the total number of British merchant vessels (exclusive of fishing craft) sunk during these four months was 290. The reader may be reminded that in this table, as in those previously given, whereas the figures of ships sunk and unsuccessfully attacked relate to British vessels only, the statistics of entrances and clearances apply to vessels of all nationalities. Various statements on the amount of tonnage sunk by submarines were made during the year, both by Allied and by hostile statesmen, but none of these statements were really comprehensive. On May 25 Admiral Lacaze, French Minister of Marine, gave out some interesting figures in the Chamber of Deputies. He said that during the first four months of the year about 2,500,000 tons of shipping had been lost through the action of mines and submarines. This total apparently related to ships of all nationalities, neutral as well as Allied. The Minister admitted that this loss exceeded the loss of tonnage incurred during the whole of 1916. Different figures were given a few days earlier by the German Minister of Marine, Admiral von Capelle, in a speech in the Reichstag. He said that during the first three months of the submarine campaign (February to April) 1,325 ships were sunk, having an aggregate gross tonnage of about 2,800,000. The alleged total related to ships of all nationalities, but even allowing for the fact that the losses in January were relatively small, there is here a considerable discrepancy between the French and German accounts. On August 16 Mr. Lloyd George delivered a speech in the House of Commons, and gave certain figures relating to the loss of British tonnage. He said that 550,000 tons were lost in April (the worst month) and only 320,000 tons in July. These totals appeared to indicate that the average tonnage of the ships sunk was not much under 4,000. Mr. Lloyd George said, further, that during 1917 Great Britain would build about 1,600,000 tons, and would acquire from abroad over 300,000 tons. The building of ships was being expedited in every possible manner (For a fuller account of this speech, see English History.)

From the figures given in this and preceding chapters it will be seen that about 990 British merchant vessels were sunk during the ten months, March to December. If the average tonnage be taken as 3,500, this represents a gross loss of approximately 3,465,000 tons to the British mercantile marine.

In the middle of November the German Government announced that the "barred zone" would be somewhat extended in various areas, and in particular that the free channel to Greece would be closed.

The incidents in the surface warfare were few and unimportant. On October 17 two German cruisers attacked a weak British convoy proceeding from Norway to Scotland. The convoy included twelve merchantmen and two escorting destroyers. The two destroyers, the *Mary Rose* and the *Strongbow*, were sunk, as were also nine of the merchantmen, five being

Norwegian, one Danish, and three Swedish. The German vessels escaped before any stronger British squadrons arrived.

In the evening of September 4 a submarine bombarded Scarborough, killing three persons.

On October 2 the armoured cruiser, H M S. *Drake*, was torpedoed off the north coast of Ireland : she reached harbour, but then sank in shallow water.

On November 2 British scouting forces sank a large German auxiliary cruiser and ten patrol boats in the Kattegat

On December 12 another British convoy was attacked in the North Sea by four powerful German destroyers, and the entire convoy was sunk. The convoy included five neutral vessels and one British merchantman, under the escort of two destroyers, H M.S. *Pellew* and H.M.S. *Partridge*, and of four armed trawlers. The *Pellew* was disabled and the *Partridge* and the four trawlers were sunk. On the same day two neutral vessels and two trawlers were sunk off the Tyne by German destroyers. In the night of December 22 three British destroyers were sunk off the Dutch coast by mines or submarines

THE WAR IN THE AIR

A series of raids upon England by German airships and aeroplanes took place in the autumn. The worst series of raids took place during September and at the beginning of October. In the night of September 3-4 about half a dozen German aeroplanes visited the Sheerness-Chatham district, and caused heavy casualties to naval ratings, 107 men being killed, and eighty-six wounded. In the following night squadrons of aeroplanes flew over London dropping bombs, eleven persons being killed and sixty-two injured. On September 24 and 25, early in the evening in each case, squadrons of hostile aeroplanes flew over London, and caused a few casualties. A similar attack was made in the evening of September 28, and another on September 30.

A great raid by airships took place on October 19. A fleet of thirteen Zeppelins passed over the south-eastern counties of England, sailing at an unusually great height—over 16,000 feet. Bombs were dropped on various districts, including London, but the casualties caused were not numerous. None of the Zeppelins were brought down in England on this occasion, but in making for home they encountered a foul wind, and several vessels were driven down in France.

In the night of October 31 about thirty German aeroplanes, flying in seven squadrons, flew over London, eight persons being killed and over twenty injured by the bombs dropped. Similar raids were carried out on December 6 and 18. On the latter occasion ten persons were killed, and seventy injured in London.

On December 11 a British airship of the non-rigid type was destroyed by a German seaplane in the southern part of the

North Sea, and on the following day a similar vessel was forced to descend in Holland owing to engine-failure.

During the autumn the British and French repeatedly carried out raids on the towns of Western Germany, and in particular Saarbrücken and Kaiseraultern were bombed.

THE OESEL OPERATIONS.

The last important operations in the Russian Theatre, before the conclusion of the formal armistice, took place on and around the islands which lie across the entrance to the Gulf of Riga. The large island of Oesel and the smaller adjacent isles are situated in such a position that when defended with modern high-range artillery they completely command the entrance into the Gulf. Now, since the Russian forces held the islands, the mere capture of Riga did not enable the Germans to use that great city as a port. A few weeks after the conquest of Riga, therefore, the German staff made the necessary preparations for the seizure of the islands. There were several motives which induced the German Government to make this move. It was, in the first instance, highly desirable to establish direct maritime communication between the German coast towns and Riga, the latter being now the headquarters of the north-eastern army. Further, the Government knew that peace negotiations with Russia could not be delayed for many months, and they hoped when these negotiations took place, to be able to bring Lithuania, with the town of Riga, into the German system, if not by actual annexation, at least by the establishment of a semi-independent Lithuanian state under German hegemony. But the possession of Riga would be of little use if Russia were to continue to command the approaches to the port, and here arose the importance, from the German point of view, of rounding off the conquest by the capture of the islands. If the Germans were in occupation of the islands at the time of the negotiations, the German Government could the more easily insist upon the inclusion of the islands in the proposed state of Lithuania.

In the face of a determined resistance by well-armed defenders the German enterprise would have been extremely hazardous, if not altogether impracticable. The Russian soldiers were, however, in no mood to offer a stubborn resistance. On October 12 a large German Fleet, consisting of ten Dreadnought battleships, twelve cruisers, fifty destroyers, and numerous mine-sweepers, appeared off the north-west coast of Oesel. After extensive mine-sweeping operations, the fortifications were brought under the fire of the Dreadnoughts, the points especially attacked being the Sworbe Peninsula (in the south-west), the Tagelacht Bay, and the Siele Sound, which separates Oesel from the island of Dago. Under the protection of the warships, a number of transports were brought up, and

from these about 25,000 troops under the command of General von Kathen were disembarked with great rapidity at Kielkond and other points on the north coast. On the 13th and 14th the fighting continued without intermission, and German cyclist corps which had been landed, made rapid progress, although part, at least, of the Russian garrison seems to have fought well. In the evening of the 13th Arenburg, the capital of Oesel was taken, the Sworbe Peninsula thus being isolated. In the meantime the Germans also advanced towards Orisar, in the hope of cutting the line of retreat of the whole garrison. In this, however, they were not successful, for a large part of the Russian force made good its escape across the mole leading to Moon Island. Naval operations also took place. On October 14 an action was fought in Siele Sound, between the small Russian squadron guarding the islands and a larger German squadron. The Russians fought well; one Russian and two German destroyers were sunk, and the German squadron was forced to retire. On the 16th the Germans announced that they had taken 3,500 prisoners and thirty guns. They also seem to have captured several uninjured aeroplanes, a fact which proves that a portion of the Russian garrison treacherously deserted its posts. After bombarding Tserel for a couple of days, and silencing the big guns (said to be of British manufacture) stationed at that point, the main squadron of the German Fleet broke through the Irben Strait, which is the channel separating the Sworbe Peninsula from the mainland of Courland, and appeared in the great gulf, there taking possession of the islets of Abro and Runo. On the 17th the force isolated on the Sworbe Peninsula, numbering 6,000 men, capitulated; and on the same day an action was fought by the rival warships in the gulf, the weak Russian squadron being compelled to retreat into the Mön Sound, with the loss of the old battleship *Slava*. It is notable that although, according to the Russian Government's reports, the main Baltic Fleet was ordered to go to the assistance of the weak squadron stationed in the gulf, no unit of that fleet appeared upon the scene. The Baltic Fleet had ceased to take the trouble to obey orders. The islands of Dago and Moon were quickly seized after this action. On the 23rd the Germans reported that their total captures in these operations included 20,130 prisoners, over 100 guns (including forty-seven heavy naval guns), 150 machine-guns, and 2,000 horses. The Germans made no permanent landing on the Estonian coast, and the general armistice shortly ensued.

THE ARMISTICE IN THE EAST.

The end of the year brought a definite cessation of hostilities between Russia and the Central Powers. It will be remembered that in November the extremist wing of the Russian Socialists, the so-called Bolsheviks, seized control of affairs in Petrograd.

The first aim in the programme of the Bolsheviks was the conclusion of an immediate peace, with or without the concurrence of Russia's Allies, on the basis of the general principle of "no annexations and no indemnities." The Bolshevik conception of the kind of peace-treaty which was desirable did not differ in essentials from the ideas of the moderate Socialists, M. Kerensky, M. Tseretelli, M. Skobelev, and others, who had preceded them in office. The important difference between the two parties was that the Bolshevik leaders were prepared to sever without scruple all the ties binding Russia to the Entente Powers. As explained elsewhere (see *Russia*) the middle-class Liberals were the only party in Russia who were, or who ever had been, truly Ententist; and the Liberals, notwithstanding that they constituted the entire Government for several weeks, and held some of the Cabinet appointments for several months, had lost rather than gained in influence by the Revolution. The old Russian Government had not been truly Ententist—it had merely been in opportunist alliance with the Western Powers. Many Russian Conservatives were actually pro-German and pro-Prussian, in the full and correct sense of those words. They were in sympathy with the ideals of Prussian Conservatives and of the Prussian Government, and they had deplored the antagonism between Russia and Germany. The moderate Socialists, also, were not Ententist. They were opposed to autocracy, and they believed, in theory, in the rights of nationalities to decide their own destinies. But they did not regard themselves as parties to the quarrel of 1914, and they held that their own autocracy, as well as the monarchical Governments of Central Europe, was to blame for the outbreak of the war. They were prepared to make peace immediately on the basis of a compromise with Berlin and Vienna. And they disclaimed all intention to interfere in the affairs of the nationalities who were subject to the Central Empires before the war, thus giving their belief in the "self-determination" of peoples a very negative rendering. Nevertheless, the moderate Socialists were determined to abide by the terms of the Pact of London, and it should not be forgotten that M. Kerensky, M. Tsereshtchenko, and their colleagues, sacrificed office and power through their refusal to secede from the alliance. Into this situation came the Bolsheviks. They accepted the negative propositions of the moderate Socialists, in regard to actual peace-terms, but they possessed in addition a positive policy which was quite peculiar to themselves. They were determined that the Russian Republic should pursue its own course, regardless of any of the engagements of the Tsarism. And, whilst they cared but little for the principle of nationalities, they had an intense belief in the importance and urgency of the social revolution and the class-war, not in Russia only, but in all Europe. They displayed nothing of Tsereshtchenko's tenderness for the feelings of the Allies. On the contrary,

they denounced the Western Powers as capitalist states which were little if at all superior to the Central Empires or the Tsarism. To them, even America was backward and undemocratic. In London and in Paris sections of the Press described the Bolsheviks as "pro-German." The term was, however, only applicable to them in the limited sense that they had finally seceded from the anti-German coalition. They were not pro-German in any positive sense. There was much true pro-Germanism to be found in East-Central and Northern Europe. The Swedish Conservatives were ardently pro-German, Finland was pro-German, and so also were the upper and middle classes in the Baltic provinces. The nobles and the middle classes of Poland were, for the most part, pro-Austrian, if not actually pro-German. Many Rumanian Conservatives were Germanophil, and the semi-independent Rada of Ruthenia appears to have become traitorously pro-German. All these influential elements in the east of Europe were favourable, or at least not hostile, to the order of society which the great monarchies represented. To all these, a peace of the two Kaisers, a settlement after the mind of the upper and middle classes of Central Europe, was not an unlikeable thing. This pro-Germanism, this real pro-Germanism, was in the main an affair of the propertied classes, and even in the Ukraine it was an affair of the anti-extremist party. But to all this the ultra-revolutionary Directory at Petrograd stood out in glaring contrast. They were extreme republicans and extreme socialists. They wanted peace because they hated international war, and hated this war, but they also wanted the social revolution. They were not pro-German in the correct sense of the word, Bolshevikism was a new thing, a thing apart. And whatever might be its fate, it was not a weak thing. And it was not only to the monarchism of Central Europe that it stood in contrast. Here was the quintessence of democracy. The flaring passionate proletarianism of Petrograd was totally unlike the quiet democracy of the Anglo-Saxon world, and unlike the faded—or sobered—revolutionary spirit of Paris. And Trotsky, the "People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs," was the incarnation of Bolshevikism.

On the side of the Central Powers there were several diverse forces at work. The German military leaders and the Conservatives were still bent on securing victory and a "German" peace. They seem to have hoped to gain certain territorial advantages in the East, notably in the Baltic Provinces, but their chief desire was to conclude, as quickly as possible, a satisfactory bargain with Petrograd, in order to be able to throw the whole weight of the German Army over to the West, for what they supposed would be a decisive blow against France. The civilian statesmen in Berlin took a different view of the situation, for in Germany the civil authorities were rarely in perfect agreement with the General Staff. The Government, and notably

Baron von Kuhlmann, wished to utilise the separate negotiations with Russia as a means for initiating a conference of all the Powers for a general peace. Kuhlmann probably doubted the ability of the generals to take Paris, even with Russia formally at peace, and in any case he did not think the chance of a great success in the West worth the terrible sacrifice necessarily involved in such an attempt. In spite of the great influence wielded by the generals at Court, the civilians maintained their rightful hold over policy, and the German authorities entered the negotiations hoping to convert them into a general conference. The Austro-Hungarian Government also took this view of the matter, and there is little doubt that Count Czernin (the Foreign Minister) and the other leaders were sincerely anxious to discover a basis for the establishment of a general European accord. Finally, the extreme wing of the German Socialists desired a peace of the peoples with no annexations and no indemnities, and they were ready enough to accept the Russian view that a social reorganisation should accompany, or immediately succeed, the international settlement.

This, therefore, was the situation in which the momentous negotiations commenced, and these were the chief factors which came into play. The reader may be reminded that the two sides together represented nearly 300 millions of white people.

Immediately after M. Lenin (the Premier) and M. Trotsky had entered into power in Petrograd, they formally announced that they were desirous of concluding an immediate armistice on all the Russian Fronts, with a view to commencing peace negotiations, and they issued an invitation to the Allied Powers to join in this movement. They suggested an armistice for three months between all the Powers, with a view to a peace on the basis of "no annexations and no indemnities." The Central Empires promptly responded; the Allies ignored the Bolshevik invitation. For a few days no further steps could be taken, because the whole attention of the new Government was required to deal with the hostile forces which M. Kerensky and his friends were leading against the capital. But Kerensky's followers having been dispersed, definite orders were sent to General Dukhonin, the Commander-in-Chief, instructing him to take the necessary measures for bringing about an armistice. General Dukhonin, whose opinions were those of Kerensky, refused to obey this order, and he was therefore superseded as Commander-in-Chief by a certain Lieutenant Krilenko. General Dukhonin was subsequently assassinated by Bolshevik soldiery, but the crime was not committed with the connivance of the new Ministry.

Preliminary communications passed between the commanders on November 26, and on December 2 the Russian plenipotentiaries crossed to the German lines, and proceeded to the headquarters of Prince Leopold of Bavaria, who was the German Commander-in-Chief in the East. The Prince's headquarters

were at Brest-Litovsk. The Russian plenipotentiaries in these preliminary negotiations for an armistice were a medical officer, a lieutenant, and a private. The first negotiations were very brief, and on December 5 an agreement for a preliminary suspension of hostilities (not a formal armistice) for ten days from December 7 was signed. Turkey and Bulgaria, as well as the Central Powers, were included in this agreement, and Rumania, owing to her geographical position, was obliged to concur in the suspension of hostilities, but the Rumanian Government issued a statement that they would not enter into peace negotiations. It was, however, obviously difficult to perceive how Rumania could prolong her resistance in the event of Russia concluding peace.

On December 6 the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a note on the progress of the armistice negotiations to the Embassies of all the States formerly allied to Russia. This note said —

“ The negotiations opened by the delegates of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria on the one side, and the delegates of Russia on the other side, have been interrupted, on the initiative of our delegation, for a week, with the purpose of providing the opportunity, during this period, of informing the peoples and Governments of the Allied countries in regard to the existence of such negotiations and on their tendency.

“ On Russia’s part it has been arranged to declare that the proposed armistice has for its object the preparation of a peace on a democratic basis as expressed in the manifesto by the All-Russian Soviet Congress ”

The note further stated that the enemy delegates had refused to discuss peace-terms, on the ground that they were only authorised to deal with the question of an armistice, and also declined to discuss a general armistice (*i.e.*, an armistice with the whole Entente), on the similar ground that they had no powers to consider an armistice with countries which had sent no delegates to the Conference.

“ Our delegates refused to sign, at this stage of the negotiations, a formal armistice, and it was decided again to suspend all hostile activities for a week, and to interrupt for the same period the negotiations on an armistice.

“ As a result, a period of over one month will exist between the first decree of November 8 by the Council’s (Government’s) authority concerning peace, and the moment of the continuance of the peace negotiations on December 12. This period is, even in the present disturbed state of international communications, amply sufficient to afford the Allied Governments the opportunity to define their attitude towards the peace negotiations, that is, their willingness or their refusal to take part in the negotiations for an armistice and peace.

“ In the case of a refusal they must declare clearly and definitely before all mankind the aims for which the peoples of

Europe may have to lose their blood during a fourth year of war."

The provisional suspension of hostilities resulted, as was expected, in the conclusion of a formal armistice. On December 15 the respective plenipotentiaries signed at Brest-Litovsk an agreement for an armistice of twenty-eight days' duration, to commence on December 17. The armistice treaty was a lengthy document, the substance of which was as follows.—

Article 1.—The armistice takes effect from December 17, 1917 (N.S.), at noon, and is to remain in force until January 14, 1918 (N.S.), at noon. The contracting parties have the right, on the twenty-first day of the armistice, to give seven days' notice to terminate it, and if this be not done, then the armistice will automatically remain in force until one of the contracting parties gives such seven days' notice.

Article 2.—The conditions of the armistice shall apply to all the land and air fighting forces of the said Powers, on the land front running between the Black Sea and the Baltic, and they shall likewise apply to the Russo-Turkish theatres of war in Asia. The contracting parties undertake, for the period that the armistice is in force, not to reinforce the troops on the said fronts or on the islands in the Moon Sound; and this also refers and applies to their formation into military units. No regrouping in preparation for an offensive is permitted. Further, the contracting parties undertake that until January 14, 1918, they will not put into operation any transfer of troops from the front between the Black Sea and the Baltic, that is to say, such transfers as had not been begun before the time when the armistice agreement was signed. Finally, the contracting parties undertake not to assemble troops in the Baltic ports east of 15 degrees longitude east of Greenwich, or in the ports of the Black Sea, during the period in which the armistice remains in force.

Article 3.—This article specified the arrangements for establishing lines of demarcation between the zones of the armies.

Article 4.—This article contained, at the suggestion of the Russians, some novel provisions "for the development and strengthening of friendly relations between the nations of the contracting parties." Organised intercourse between the troops would be permitted under certain conditions. Thus:

(a) Intercourse would, of course, be permissible for the properly accredited representatives who were to take part in the peace-pourparlers.

(b) Further, on the front of each Russian division, two or three centres of intercourse were to be established, but not more than twenty-five men from each side were to be present at any such centre at the same time. And this fraternisation was only to be allowed between sunrise and sunset.

(c) The interment of the dead in the neutral zone between the armies was to be permissible.

(d) The question of the return to their homes, of soldiers discharged from service in one country, in cases where the homes are within the zones of the other army must be decided in the peace negotiations.

(e) Persons crossing the lines contrary to these rules would be arrested.

(f) The contracting parties agreed to inform their respective soldiery regarding these points

Article 5.—This laid down conditions for the naval armistice

Article 6.—This prohibited musketry practice near the respective front lines.

Article 7—This named certain places for the establishment of special commissions charged with the duty of supervising the conduct of the armistice. These places were: Riga, Dvinsk, Brest-Litovsk, Berditcheff, Koloczvar, Focsan, and Odessa.

Article 8.—All previous agreements for a suspension of hostilities were to be superseded by this definite armistice-treaty.

Article 9.—The contracting parties immediately after the signature of the present Armistice Agreement will begin peace negotiations.

Article 10.—Taking their stand upon the freedom and independence and territorial inviolability of the neutral portion of the Persian Empire, the Turkish and Russian High Commands are both prepared to withdraw their troops from Persia. They will immediately enter into communication with the Persian Government in order to arrange details for their evacuation and also for the guaranteeing of the above-mentioned principle and for the establishment of other necessary measures.

A supplement stated that agreements had already been reached respecting the exchange of civilian prisoners, and military prisoners unfit for further service, and respecting the re-establishment of commercial and postal intercourse within the limits of the terms of the armistice

The armistice having been thus concluded, the Powers concerned entered immediately into peace negotiations, but up to the end of the year these negotiations had not proceeded far. Count Hertling, Baron von Kuhlmann, and Count Czernin went to Brest-Litovsk, and the German Government invited M. Trotsky to meet them there.

It seemed to the onlooker that the negotiations were taking place upon very unequal terms. The debate, it must be admitted, was not unlike a discussion between conquerors and conquered. The Russian Army had become a disorganised mob incapable of undertaking serious operations. The Russian plenipotentiaries therefore possessed little support of a material character. Yet Trotsky had a plan. He had perforce to rely upon moral factors, and foreseeing that the terms of the German Government, even when moderated by the milder and more enlightened influence of Austria, were likely to be onerous, he

proposed to appeal over the head of the German Government to the Socialists, and especially the extreme Socialists, of the Central Empires. Trotsky knew that his own aims and the ideals of the German Socialists were in accord, and he hoped to place the German Government in such a position that if it pressed unjust and imperialist terms it would be faced with a revolt among its own people. The plan appeared hardly better than a forlorn hope. But the Russian Government were struggling with almost insuperable difficulties, and in reality no other course was open to them, save abject surrender.

Up to the end of the year only the preliminary exchanges of view had taken place. The Russian suggestions for peace-terms were:—

(1) No forcible annexations of territories taken in the course of the war. (2) Complete restoration of independence to the nationalities which had lost it during the war. (3) Nationalities not hitherto enjoying independence to have the right to decide by plebiscite whether they would be united to other states or acquire independence. (4) Safeguarding of the rights of minorities in territories inhabited by several nationalities. (5) No war indemnities, but war requisitions to be returned. (6) Colonial questions to be decided on the same principles. The Russians also condemned everything in the nature of an economic war.

On Christmas Day Count Czernin replied to these proposals, on behalf of the four allied Central States. The Foreign Minister said that the Central Powers desired "an immediate general peace without forcible acquisitions of territory and without war indemnities." Count Czernin then replied point by point to the Russian suggestions, having stipulated, however, that the Central Powers could not bind themselves formally to the Russian principles until Russia's Allies did the same. He accepted point (1). In regard to (2) he was likewise quite unequivocal, and said: "It is not the intention of the Allies to rob of its independence any of the nations which in the course of this war have lost their independence." He refused (3), saying that these questions were not international problems, but were affairs between each state and its own people. He accepted (4). In regard to (5), he suggested that "each Power should only have to indemnify for the expenditure for its nationals who have become prisoners of war, and for damage done in its own territory by illegal acts against civilians of hostile nationality." In respect of (6), he said that Germany demanded the return of her colonies, and that plebiscites were impracticable under colonial conditions.

The Russian delegation included MM. Joffe, Kameneff, and others, but Trotsky himself was not present at the preliminary meetings.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I

OPENING OF THE YEAR

THE beginning of the year 1917 found the people as fully determined as they had ever been to continue the war, at whatever sacrifices, until a victorious conclusion had been reached. The sacrifices which they had to suffer continued slowly to increase during the course of the year. We recorded the fact that at the end of 1916 the two questions which were most prominent in public attention were that of the proposed new scheme for universal national service and that for reducing the consumption of food. The national service scheme soon broke down, as we shall subsequently relate, but the food question grew steadily in importance throughout the year; for it became apparent that a successful solution of this problem was one of the most important factors for securing ultimate victory.

The new year witnessed the inauguration of various minor social changes, which had been foreshadowed at the end of 1916. The most important of these was that affecting railway travelling, for on January 1 the new order came into force, under which the train services became considerably slower and less frequent than heretofore, while a general increase of 50 per cent took place in fares. On the same day also baking of standard bread became compulsory, in which the proportion of wheat was fixed by the new order. These innovations were received with very little complaint. The public generally accepted the new railway arrangements with resignation, and the few criticisms, which were inevitably made at first, soon died away.

There was considerable public interest at the beginning of the year in a singular case affecting Army discipline. Some months previously an Act of Parliament had been passed entitled the Army (Courts of Enquiry) Act, for the purpose of investigating certain matters concerning not only officers, but civilians whose names were not disclosed. The Act was passed without any public intimation as to the identity of the persons concerned; and the Court which was to conduct the inquiry was under the Presidency of Field-Marshal Lord Nicholson. On December 22 the names of those concerned were announced in the House of Commons, and an undertaking was given that the whole of the findings of the Court should be made public. They were, in fact, published on January 3. The first case inquired into

concerned the granting of a Commission to Sergeant P. Barrett, Royal Welsh Fusiliers, and his removal from one battalion of the regiment to another. This removal followed a letter of remonstrance sent to a lady, Mrs. Cornwallis-West, by 2nd Lieut. Barrett, who had "consistently failed to respond" to "a more than ordinary interest" which she had taken in him. The Court of Enquiry in their findings entirely exonerated 2nd Lieut. Barrett from any censure in the matter, and he received the congratulations of the Secretary for War on his complete vindication. The Court found that General Sir W. H. MacKinnon, formerly G.O.C. Western Command, had been actuated by good intentions, but showed want of judgment and discretion in intervening in a disciplinary matter which had ceased to concern him. With regard to Lieut.-General Sir J. Cowans, Quartermaster-General, who had conducted a correspondence with Mrs. Cornwallis-West about the case, they found that this correspondence showed indiscretion, and was a departure from official propriety. In view of distinguished war service he was retained for the present in his position, but he was informed of the displeasure of the Government. The Court found that Lieut-Colonel Delmé-Radcliffe, commanding Royal Welsh Fusiliers, had acted hastily, harshly, and improperly; and that he had been influenced by a lady of position in the county to such an extent as to deny justice to one of his junior officers. Finally, the Court of Enquiry stated its opinion that Mrs. Cornwallis-West had acted in a highly discreditable manner and had given untruthful evidence. With the issue of this report was cleared up the mystery hanging about the inquiry ever since the passage of the Army (Courts of Enquiry) Act in the preceding year.

For a long time past *The Times* and other influential organs had criticised the delay of the late Government in bringing definitely to an end the business of enemy Banks in London. At the beginning of the war, Sir William Plender had been appointed to administer the German and Austrian Branch Banks in London. On October 26, of 1916, the Treasury called for a report from him on the work done in his controllership, and this report, dated December 16, was published on January 4 in the form of a Blue Book. The report stated that at the outbreak of war the assets of the five Banks, the Deutsche Bank, the Dresdner Bank, the Direction der Disconto-Gesellschaft, the Oesterreichische Laenderbank, and the Anglo-Austrian Bank were returned at 23,373,494*l.* and the liabilities at 28,481,007*l.*, leaving an apparent deficiency of 5,107,513*l.*; that by September 30 last this deficiency had been reduced by 87,091*l.* to 5,020,422*l.*; that liabilities to British, Allied, and Neutral subjects to the extent of 27,600,000*l.* had been discharged by September 30; that the accommodation granted by the Bank of England to these Banks in order to enable them to pay off their acceptances had been reduced by the end of Sep-

tember from 11,835,037*l.* to 4,810,823*l.*; that securities valued at 26,000,000*l.* remained in the custody of the Banks on September 30, that detailed particulars of 3,000,000*l.* of these had been furnished to the Custodians, and that the remainder would be lodged by the end of March next; that the cost of control was 24,011*l.* down to June 30, 1916, and that to complete the work required under the licences the following work remained to be done:—

- (1) The collection of outstanding assets must proceed as far as possible, and any surplus assets be deposited with the Bank of England. In the case of each of the Banks, except the Deutsche Bank, the Bank of England advance had not been repaid, and in the case of the Laenderbank the claims of unsecured creditors had not been met in full;
- (2) The remaining balances and securities held by the Banks on behalf of non-enemy customers must be withdrawn;
- (3) Securities other than those at the free disposal of non-enemy customers must be vested in the Custodian and the lens of the Banks realised.

Sir William Plender suggested that as the premises of the German Banks were to be sold, his appointment as controller should come to an end as soon as possession was given to the purchasers. In regard to the allegations made in August, 1914, that the German and Austrian Banks had been shipping abnormal quantities of securities and bullion to the Continent, just before the outbreak of war, the supervisors appointed to the different Banks reported in all cases that they had been unable to discover that any unusual movement of the kind had occurred. This report was generally welcomed by the Press as the first step towards the final clearing out of the German Banks from the City of London.

It will be remembered that towards the end of 1916 President Wilson had addressed Notes to the various belligerent Powers with the view to promoting peace negotiations as soon as possible. To this Note the Allied Governments sent a joint reply, which was dated from Paris, January 10, and published in London on January 12. In the course of this reply the Allies declared their general object with more precision than they had hitherto done. First among them was the restoration of the small countries over-run by Germany. Belgium, Serbia, and Montenegro must be set free and receive the compensation due to them. The liberation of the occupied portion of France, Russia, and Roumania, with reparation for the damage done, was also insisted upon. The Allies disavowed absolutely any intention to bring about "the extermination or the political disappearance of the Germanic people." Such a desire would stand, said the Note, in flagrant contradiction to the very principle of nationalities, which was a corner-stone in the policy of the Allies. The peace desired by the Allies was a peace

founded on those doctrines of liberty, justice, and inviolable fidelity to national engagements, which America had always cherished and revered. The Note then continued by saying that such a peace must be based not only on respect for nationalities but also on the right of "all peoples, small and great," to full security and to liberty of economic development. It must be secured by Territorial Conventions and national settlements which would prevent such deeds as the violation of Belgium. It must provide for the restoration of Provinces torn from the Allies by force or against the wishes of the inhabitants. [This was interpreted as a reference to Alsace-Lorraine] It must ensure the liberation of the Italians, Slavs, Rumanes, and Czecho-Slovaks from foreign dominion and the *risorgimento* of Poland; while finally it must free the population under Turkish territory and end for ever the rule of the Ottoman in Europe. The publication of this Note was received with general satisfaction by the Press in the Allied countries. There is no doubt that it expressed the sentiments prevalent among the various peoples. In America the reply of the Allies to President Wilson received cordial welcome, and the ideals which it expressed were generally praised by the Press. In Germany, on the other hand, there was much indignation on learning of the war aims of the Allies. The Kaiser himself proclaimed the burning indignation and holy wrath of the German people at the rejection of his peace offer, and asserted that the Germans were ready for all sacrifices.

Meanwhile preparations were being made for the issue of a new War Loan on a larger scale than that of any previous occasion. On January 5 the Chancellor of the Exchequer explained his proposals to a meeting of Bankers in the City, and on the 11th the terms were announced to the public in a great meeting held at the Guildhall with the Lord Mayor in the Chair. Mr. Bonar Law, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, then announced the conditions of the loan. The basis of it was the issue of 5 per cent Government Stock at 95. The loan was for a period of thirty years, but the State retained the option to redeem it at par at the end of twelve years. Five per cent. of the loan was to be paid on application and the balance in fairly equal proportions, the last instalment being payable on May 30. There was also a "tax-compounded" loan at 4 per cent to be issued at par. It was to be redeemable at the end of twelve years and its period was twenty-five years. The 4½ per cent. War Loan and 5 per cent. and 6 per cent. Exchequer Bonds could be converted into the new loan at par. For every 100*l.* of these securities the holder would receive 105*l.* 5*s.* 3*d.* in the new loan. Treasury Bills could also be converted at a discount rate of 5 per cent. and War Expenditure Certificates at 5½ per cent. There was no right of conversion for the 3½ per cent. War Loan. The small stamp duty hitherto charged for the Power of Attorney to enable stock to change hands

would not be charged in the case of this loan. For the first time a sinking fund was to be set up, and for each month one-eighth of one per cent. of the capital would be set aside until 10,000,000*l.* had been accumulated, to be used in purchasing the stock whenever it fell below the issue price. The loan was to be accepted at the issue price in payment of death duties on condition that the deceased person was in possession of it for six months before his death. In addition to these main features, Mr. Bonar Law stated that foreign and colonial holders of the stock would not be liable to British taxation. Registered stock would not be charged income tax at the source. The lowest figure at which loans would be received was 5*l* and multiples of 5*l*. Sums of 5*l* and upwards were to be received through the Post Office. Finally, the Bankers, supported by the Bank of England, would give every facility to their customers to take loans in order to subscribe to the War Loan.

Mr. Bonar Law's announcement of the conditions of the loan was followed by a speech from Mr. Lloyd George, in which the Prime Minister emphasised the importance of securing a big loan, not merely for the financing of the war, but as a demonstration of the continued resolve of this country to prosecute it. Referring to the recent German peace manœuvres, he said that the Kaiser had attempted to drug those whom he could no longer dragoon. They had not offered us terms but a trap baited with fair words. Turning next to the Rome Conference, he affirmed that the Delegates had no delusions as to the magnitude of the Allies' task, and no doubts as to the result. It was one of the most business-like Conferences he had ever attended, and the parties separated with the feeling that if victory was difficult defeat was impossible. He was struck more and more by the increasing extent to which the Allied peoples were looking to Great Britain. She was to them like a great tower in the deep. She was becoming more and more the hope of the oppressed and the despair of the oppressor. He insisted that a big loan would help to ensure victory, to shorten the war, and to save the Empire, Europe, and civilisation. He repeated his warning against the squandering of money in luxury. Extravagance, he declared, cost the blood of heroes.

Throughout the next few weeks canvassing was carried on in all parts of the country on behalf of the new loan. In every quarter it was received with patriotic enthusiasm. Large subscriptions began to come in even on the first day of issue, when the Prudential Assurance Company headed the list with 20,000,000*l.*, and three other subscriptions of a million pounds or over were received.

On January 18 two other new War Loans were announced. One was to be raised in India, and the entire proceeds were to be made over to the Imperial Government for war purposes. Another was arranged in the United States by Messrs. J. P.

Morgan & Co. for \$250,000,000 (50,000,000*l.*) in the form of 5*½* per cent. convertible notes, of which \$100,000,000 (20,000,000*l.*) would mature in one year and the remainder in two years. On the same day the Bank of England reduced its discount rate from 6 per cent. to 5*½* per cent., this reduction being calculated to assist the raising of the War Loan by reducing the charges on short borrowings, and tending to raise the value of other securities. The rates at which customers could borrow from the Banks for subscriptions to the loan had already been fixed at a minimum of 5 per cent. Another important speech was made by Mr Bonar Law in Glasgow on the War Loan on January 18, and next day it was announced that Sir William Dunn, Lord Mayor of London, was taking steps to organise a special campaign to further the success of the War Loan during the last fortnight that the lists should be open. The further progress of this campaign will be recorded later.

We have already observed that the question of the food supply appeared at the beginning of the year to be one of the most important problems which had to be dealt with by the Government. The Office of the Food Controller soon embarked on very active measures, and new orders were constantly being made throughout the year. At the end of the first week of January the price of wheat to growers was fixed at 60*s.* per quarter of 504 lb. for the 1917 crop; of oats at 38*s.* 6*d.* per quarter of 336 lb.; and of potatoes in quantities of not less than 6 tons at 11*½**s.* per ton for delivery from September 15 to January 31, at 120*s.* per ton for delivery in February and March, and 130*s.* per ton for the remainder of the season. Six new orders were made a few days later. They provided among other things for the extraction of a larger percentage of flour from wheat, and put a check on the use of sugar for the manufacture of luxurious sweets and confectionery. The policy of the Government in fixing prices for the next potato harvest was met with much criticism; and in the middle of the month Mr. Prothero, President of the Board of Agriculture, defended his action at two largely attended meetings of farmers at Hereford and Newport (Mon.). He stated that the policy of the Government was to concentrate the potato crops mainly on those lands where the largest yield could be obtained at the least expenditure. Where the prospects were poor, the land should be put to some better use. But every village and small town should try to make itself self-supporting with regard to potatoes. Notwithstanding Mr. Prothero's defence, the extent of criticism caused a modification of the original order. On January 19 the Food Controller announced that the prices fixed for the main crop of 1917 were a minimum price payable to growers. The maximum growers' prices for seed potatoes were fixed and came into force on the 22nd.

Further announcements were issued from the Food Controller's Office in the course of January. One concerned a Bill

which was to be brought in at the next session of Parliament for the purpose of reducing the quantity of beer which was allowed to be brewed to 70 per cent of the output for the current financial year ending March 31, 1917. The object of this restriction was to increase the amount of barley, sugar, and other brewing ingredients available for the purpose of food and also to economise tonnage, transport, labour, and fuel. A corresponding restriction was to be placed upon the release of wine and spirits from bond. Another announcement was that the importation of rice for sale in the United Kingdom would, in future, be controlled by the Royal Commission on Wheat Supplies.

Among the less important subjects of public interest during the month of January was the raiding of the Editor's room in the office of *The Field* newspaper on the 15th. The raid had no reference whatever to the newspaper or the proprietors of *The Field*, nor was it connected with the position of Sir Theodore Cook as Editor. In a letter to *The Times* Sir Theodore explained that the official visit arose out of certain difficulties which he had experienced with Government Departments as Chairman of a Syndicate manufacturing a certain explosive. The raid was not accompanied by any search, for the officials concerned accepted Sir Theodore's word of honour that no papers connected with the Syndicate were to be found at the office of *The Field* or at his private residence. The inquiry which ultimately ensued into the origin of this raid will be referred to later.

One of the most tragic events of the month was an explosion which occurred at a Munitions Factory in the East End of London on the evening of January 19. The damage done was very severe, four large industrial works and several smaller ones being destroyed, and rows of small house property being demolished. The total number of casualties was over 450, including sixty-nine killed and seventy-two seriously injured.

The views of the Labour elements in the country gradually acquired increasing importance in the course of the year. On January 23 the sixteenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party was opened at Manchester, with Mr. George Wardle, M.P., in the Chair. Mr. Wardle, in his presidential address, admitted the absence of uniformity of thought among the various sections of the Labour Group. He suggested indeed that diversity of opinion inside the party was to be desired, so long as it did not preclude unity of action. Dealing with the part which Labour was playing in the war, Mr. Wardle again admitted that the Labour party was not wholly agreed and that he spoke only for the majority. He did not minimise the sacrifices which they had made of cherished principles, but he pointed out that the measures of restraint to which they had submitted were for the purpose of winning greater freedom. The co-operation of Labour had been freely given to the Government, because the

issues of the war were fundamental to liberty. There were loud shouts of applause when Mr. Wardle declared that no peace was possible until Germany had renounced her war aims. A reference to recent peace manœuvres and the mention of President Wilson also evoked an outburst of enthusiasm from the pacifist section. Mr. Wardle then passed to a survey of new problems which had arisen from the wreckage of old methods and ideas. The Government, he said, had begun too slowly and imperfectly to organise national resources on national lines. Nearly all the domestic problems of the day sprang from profiteering, which the Government had been slow and weak in tackling, but the problems which would come when the war ended were even greater. Whatever else might happen, the State could never go back to the old policy of *laisser-faire*. Mr. Wardle's programme for Labour included justice for the ex-soldiers; adequate pensions for widows, and full education for children; employment for all at good wages and an equal share for all in governing, a fair basis of taxation and a larger share for Labour in the control of their own destiny.

The remainder of the first day's sitting was devoted to a long debate on the wisdom of the Executive Committee in accepting a share in the reconstructed Government; but their action was finally endorsed by a majority of six to one. The next day was occupied in great part by a discussion of the future restoration of Trade Union conditions and of the deportation of engineers from the Clyde, which had taken place nine months previously. One of the deported men, indeed, turned up in the hall and denounced the action which had been taken against him. He was answered by Mr. Henderson, who expressed the view that he and his friends were a danger both to Trade Unionism and to the nation, for they had repudiated the officials of their own society and had told the Minister of Munitions that he would only get his munitions when he had handed over the works to their control. He suggested that the Conference should appoint a Committee to investigate the incident before it condemned the Government. Finally, a Resolution was passed demanding the immediate and unconditional return of deported men, and this Resolution was telegraphed to the Prime Minister. With regard to the restoration of Trade Union conditions after the war, a Resolution was carried reminding the Government of their pledges and warning them against evasion.

On January 25 the Labour Party Conference adopted, after short discussion, various resolutions on taxation, electoral reform, and the position of women in industry. A Resolution was put forward by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, rejecting the idea of a rigid industrial truce, but welcoming the initiation of negotiations between organised workers and organised employers for the settlement of future industrial problems by agreement. Opposition to this Resolution came from the London Society of Compositors, who contended that the proposal

was in conflict with the decision of the Trade Union Congress to enter into negotiation for a general three years' truce. As a result of this opposition the Resolution was finally limited to a simple declaration against compulsory arbitration, and the Committee was instructed to bring before the Government the decision which the Conference had reached by a deputation to the Prime Minister.

Some debates took place on Resolutions proposed by the Pacifist groups. The Independent Labour Party desired the early re-establishment of the International Socialist Bureau, while the British Socialist Party invited the Conference to declare for a speedy termination of hostilities. Both proposals were rejected by large majorities, and a Resolution submitted by Mr. W. Thorne, M.P., was carried, expressing the determination of the Conference to continue the fight until victory had been achieved.

On the last day of the Conference a Resolution was adopted in favour of the establishment of a League of Nations to enforce peace; and another expressing hostility to "proposals of the new Government in the direction of setting up a system of complete industrial conscription"; discontent was also recorded with the existing restrictions on civil liberty. The only remaining business of importance that was transacted concerned the representation of the various groups of the Labour Party on the Executive. By a narrow majority the excessive representation which had formerly been allotted to the extreme Socialistic section was done away with, and it was decided that in future all the seats in the Executive should be filled by a ballot of the whole Conference.

At the end of the month the report of the Speaker's Conference on electoral reform was issued. A full account of its recommendations is given in the section on Public Documents. Its main feature was the reduction of the qualifying period for registration as a Parliamentary elector to six months instead of twelve months, as at present. Moreover, the register was to be revised every six months, instead of every twelve months, so that voters would not have to wait nearly so long after changing their residence before their names were included in the register. The report further recommended that the whole of the present franchise system should be swept away and replaced by two simple franchises, residence or occupation of business premises. Plural voting was condemned, two exceptions only being made to the general rule of one man one vote. These were that a voter should be allowed to poll in his place of business as well as in his place of residence, and in the case of the University franchise. A controversial feature of the report was its recommendation that in large Boroughs and in groups of continuous Boroughs the system of voting should be by Proportional Representation.

The unanimous recommendations of the Committee were

supplemented by others on which unanimity was, in the nature of things, impossible. Most important of these was that which related to Woman Suffrage. Mr Lowther stated that he had deliberately selected his colleagues in approximately equal numbers from both parties in this particular controversy. The innovation was favoured by the majority, who considered that a grave injustice would be inflicted on women if they were left after the war to fight their industrial battles without such help as was provided by the vote. A scheme was submitted for the redistribution of seats on the principle that the standard unit of population should be 70,000 for each member, and that any county or borough with less than 50,000 population should cease to have separate representation.

Under the recommendations of this report the franchise was to be extended to every man of full age who for the qualifying period had resided in any premises or occupied business premises of a clear yearly value of not less than 10*l.* Disqualification was not to be applied to persons who had received poor relief for less than thirty days during the qualifying period. The basis of the proposed Woman Suffrage was to be the attainment of a certain age that was not specified. Above that age the vote was to be given to any woman on the Local Government Register, or whose husband was on that register. Notwithstanding the radical departures involved in these recommendations the report was well received throughout the country. It was recognised that its conclusions represented a compromise, but a compromise that most people were prepared to support. Accordingly it was not long before a Bill was introduced to give practical effect to the proposed alterations, and we shall have to describe later the progress of that Bill in Parliament.

Two important speeches were made during the first week in February on the national objects of the war. At Ladybank on the first day of the month, Mr. Asquith addressed his constituents for the first time since he had ceased to be Prime Minister. He did not dwell on the reasons which had led to his resignation, but emphasised the need of putting all the energies of a united nation into the prosecution of the war. The notion of the conflict ending in a "drawn game" he dismissed as a "mere dream," and declared that the resources of the Allies assured them of inevitable victory. Referring to the recent speech of President Wilson, he said that we must fight on to ensure a decisive victory in the field; for this could be the only precursor of a solid and enduring peace.

Two days later Mr Lloyd George likewise delivered to his constituency the first speech which he had addressed to them since he became Prime Minister. He admitted that there was much in the present condition of affairs which must necessarily cause anxiety. He had never had any doubt of ultimate victory; neither had he any doubt that before we reached it

there were many broad and turbulent rivers to be crossed which the nation must help to bridge. He referred to "the great and growing menace of German piratical devices." He said that their attitude towards the United States was insolence that amounted to insanity. He appealed to the nation to support the Government in men, money, labour, in the sacrifices of conveniences and even of comforts. We should then pull through in our deadly struggle with "these desperadoes." He claimed that in the new Government for the first time success in business had been put on the same footing as success in politics as a ground for the conferment of high office. He appealed for fair play for the Government who must be given time to look round.

A considerable part of the speech emphasised the need of sacrifice. He said that in order to win we must endure more. In the past the sacrifices had been too much relegated to the men in the trenches. A big loan would shorten the war; a big number of subscribers would shorten it further. He appealed to housewives to see each one in her own home that not an ounce of food was eaten beyond the amount laid down by Lord Devonport. Those who were doing nothing should do something; those who were doing something should do more, and all should do their best. Every one who had got enough land to grow a potato or a cabbage must use it for that purpose. Referring to the inconvenience of the train service and the increase of fares, he asked his audience to remember that the limitation of railway facilities helped the army. The speech was received with great enthusiasm and was widely praised in the Press.

It is possible that the popularity undoubtedly possessed by the Prime Minister at this time was due in a small part to the recent announcement of a plot to murder Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Arthur Henderson. On January 31 four members of a Derby family were brought up before the Derby Borough Magistrates on a charge of conspiring to murder these two statesmen. On February 6 they were committed for trial at the Derbyshire Assizes, though it was subsequently agreed that the case should be transferred to the Central Criminal Court. The trial did not come on till the beginning of April, when we shall refer to it again.

Meanwhile, propaganda was steadily carried on on behalf of the new War Loan. Mr. Balfour delivered an important speech at Sheffield on January 31, pointing out the importance of money for the attainment of victory. On February 9 a demonstration was held in front of the Royal Exchange, in the course of which the Lord Mayor made a patriotic appeal in support of the Loan, and expressed the hope that at the end of the meeting all who had not already purchased stock would step over to the Mansion House, where facilities were provided for them to do so. On Sunday, February 11, numerous sermons were preached

in various parts of the country, at the instigation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, urging the public to advance money for the prosecution of the war. Thus the campaign continued until the lists were closed on February 16. On that day the Banks, Post Offices, and other places where subscriptions were lodged were besieged long before the customary hour of opening, while at the Bank of England an unbroken stream passed in and out of the folding doors at the two entrances. By February 19 Mr Bonar Law was able to announce in the House of Commons that the Loan had been a success beyond the hopes of the Government, but it was not till February 26 that he was able to declare that the War Loan had yielded no less than 1,000,312,950*l.* in new money. The actual number of subscribers was 5,289,000, out of which 3,200,000 was the figure, partly only estimated, for purchasers of War Savings Certificates during the five weeks for which the Loan was open. From this source 19,300,000*l.* was obtained. In the applications through the Bank of England only 22,000,000*l.* were invested in the 4 per cent tax-compounded loan—the overwhelming preference having been for the 5 per cent. issue subject to income tax. The result was naturally received with great enthusiasm throughout the country. The success of the Loan was to be attributed entirely to the patriotism of the people. Mr. Bonar Law justly declared that it was an expression of the will of the people to win the war, and afforded evidence of the financial ability of this country to see it to a successful conclusion.

The campaign on behalf of food economy was carried on vigorously throughout the month of February. On the second of the month a report on the food supply of the United Kingdom was issued by a Committee of the Royal Society, making various recommendations for economising the resources of the nation. It was pointed out that in the five years before the war a substantial margin of waste existed after the apportionment of the food supply among the population. In July, 1916, there was evidence that the supply of food had not diminished; suggestions were made for a better recovery of flour in milling; for an increased economy in meat production, for an increase in the manufacture of cheese; for the use as food of materials at present employed in brewing and distilling, and for the diversion of a certain quantity of material now used for stock food to human food. On the same day Lord Devonport issued an important statement in the course of which he laid down a scheme of voluntary rationing for the observance of the public. He emphasised the urgent necessity for some curtailment of the nation's food consumption. He pointed out that compulsory rationing involved very elaborate machinery and absorbed labour, and for that reason ought to be avoided unless it became absolutely necessary. Accordingly he singled out the three most important articles of daily consumption, namely, bread, meat, and sugar, and called upon the heads of families to limit

themselves to the weekly purchase for each person comprising the household of the following quantities per head: bread 4 lb. (or its equivalent in flour, 3 lb. for bread making); meat 2½ lb.; sugar ¼ lb. It was recognised that different persons required more or less than the average of these commodities, but it was held that these individual needs could be averaged out within the household itself. Lord Devonport added that in case compulsory rationing should become necessary, the machinery for bringing it into operation was being organised.

No official pronouncement about the National Service scheme was made during January. On the 27th of that month *The Times* did indeed forecast many of the main features of the new scheme, but the matter was not formally placed before the public until February 6, when Mr. Neville Chamberlain launched his programme at a public meeting in the Central Hall, Westminster. The main purpose of the scheme was to find a sufficient number of substitutes who might be used to replace men taken for Active Service. The bulk of the men required for the Army were in munition works, coal mines, shipbuilding, transport work, and agriculture, and Mr. Chamberlain hoped to be able to draft into these occupations a large number of persons, thus releasing an equivalent number for military service. The scheme was organised on a voluntary basis, although the Prime Minister announced the intention of the Government to resort to compulsion if voluntary methods failed. In the first instance the appeal made was only to men. The age-limits were 18 to 60, and the rate of pay was to be the standard rate for the job to which a man might be sent, with a *minimum* of 25s. a week. It was not intended to take men already engaged in work of national importance, nor would anyone be able to escape military service by volunteering. The volunteers would have to go wherever they might be asked by the Director-General, but as far as possible they were to be kept in their own districts, and in any case they were not to be put to any other occupations than those for which they had volunteered. Recruiting for national civilian service was to be carried out through the Employment Exchanges with the assistance of the Local Authorities. Further details that were announced concerned the methods of enrolment and the division of the country into five recruiting areas. No trade was to be suppressed, but it was intended that non-essential trades should be rationed in labour and materials, and such trades were recommended to pool resources in plant and labour.

After Mr. Chamberlain had explained his plan, Mr. Lloyd George spoke in support of it. He stated that Great Britain had sent fewer men to the Army and Navy in proportion to her population than any of the Great Powers of the West. That did not mean, he added, that she was shirking her responsibilities, for she was contributing in other ways to the success of the

Allies. Nevertheless millions of our best men had gone and the gap in labour must be filled. The present scheme was organised on a voluntary basis, and this, said the Prime Minister, was undoubtedly preferable if it succeeded. The goodwill and co-operation of the great labour organisations were in themselves a military asset, but if the voluntary appeal failed it would be necessary to resort to compulsion. "The nation is fighting for its life: it is fighting for the life of civilisation."

Both Houses of Parliament opened on February 7. The King who delivered his speech in person, referred to the peace overtures which had been made by the enemy, and remarked that their tenor indicated no possible basis for negotiations. He emphasised the steadfast resolution of the people to secure the just demands for reparation and restitution in respect of the past, and for guarantees as to the future, which were so essential to the progress of civilisation. The accomplishment of the task before the country would entail unsparing demands on the energies and resources of all His Majesty's subjects. He was assured, however, that his people would respond to every call necessary for the success of our cause with the same indomitable ardour and devotion as heretofore.

The debate on the address in the House of Commons was opened by Mr McCurdy and Admiral of the Fleet Sir Hedworth Meux, both of whom declared the determination of the country to fight until victory was won. The most important speech of the day, however, was made by Mr Asquith, who was cordially received by members of all parties, and who addressed to the Government a series of practical questions designed to ascertain what had been done since the prorogation to promote food production and shipbuilding. Turning to the new German submarine threat, Mr. Asquith denounced it as a declaration of war upon neutrality. The challenge he said had been accepted with dignity and without delay by the head of the most powerful Neutral State. He could not forecast the bearing of this event on the future of the war, still less tender advice to the United States Government, "but," said Mr. Asquith, "we may and we shall hail with acclamation the stern and resolute determination of the other great English-speaking power to frustrate this last enormity of the enemies of the human race."

Notwithstanding calls for the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith was answered by Mr. Bonar Law, who stated that arrangements had been approved for bringing shipping under the control of the Government in the same way as had already been done with the railways. The coming Imperial Conference would not be bound by hard and fast rules, but would discuss all items of common interest in connexion with the war; and on many questions the Dominion Prime Ministers would have continuous sittings as members of the Cabinet. Mr. Bonar Law referred to the submarine peril as "one of the greatest dangers against which we have to fight." New expedients had to be devised to meet

it, and some of the best brains in the Navy and in the country were now concentrated on the problem.

In the House of Lords, Lord Curzon gave a review of the progress of the war in the various theatres, and incidentally mentioned the losses which had been suffered by the Peerage in the course of the war. Six Peers, 120 sons of Peers, and 62 heirs to Peerages had fallen.

Next day Mr. Bonar Law referred to the pressure which had been placed upon him to restore to private members their privilege of introducing Bills into Parliament. He warned the House that the country had come to the very crisis of its fate, and he refused to accept the plea that the restrictions adopted at the beginning of the war were no longer necessary. He warned members, moreover, that he would not attempt to carry on the Government if the ordinary methods of party fighting or the practice of throwing difficulties in their way were adopted. The first business to which the House turned itself was a discussion of the question of increasing the food production of the country. There was some criticism of the Government, especially on account of the recent withdrawal of workers on the land for service in the Army. Mr. Prothero met most of the points raised, adding that the number of men so far withdrawn from the land under the new Army Order was 6,800. He gave an account of the new organisations which had been set up by the Board of Agriculture to deal with the new situation. Branches had been established to stimulate food production and to deal with labour and machinery. Thirty-two motor transports had been acquired, and 230 more had been ordered, all of which would probably be at work in the country before the middle of March. All the German prisoners (6,000) and interned aliens who were skilled in agriculture had been secured as substitutes. It was hoped also to secure the service of 50,000 or 60,000 women in addition to those already employed on the land, that would mean the equivalent of 35,000 men. Finally, Mr. Prothero warned the farmers that before long animals would have to be rationed. We had never had so much live stock in the country as we had now, and too much human food could not be sacrificed to animals.

This statement was supplemented later by a speech from Captain Charles Bathurst, for the Food Controller's Department. He announced that the masters of fox-hounds had decided on their own initiative to reduce substantially the number of days' hunting throughout England and Wales; and that they were prepared to slaughter a very large proportion of hounds. Some masters of hounds were shooting foxes and advising members of their hunts to shoot them, in order to prevent the destruction of poultry or garden stuff. After a few other speeches, the address in reply to the King's speech was agreed.

It was inevitable that one of the earliest duties of Parliament would be to pass fresh Votes of Credit for the carrying on of

the war, and in fact on February 12, Mr. Bonar Law introduced two new Votes of Credit amounting to 550,000,000*l.*, the largest amount ever asked for at a single sitting in the financial history of the country. He estimated that even this colossal sum would only carry the Government on to the end of May. The figures which he presented showed that the daily expenditure of the nation had now reached the highest point yet recorded in the war. The average daily expenditure in the early part of the financial year was 4,520,000*l.* It was 5,710,000*l.* in the last period under review, and had now risen to 5,790,000*l.* A great part of the increase was due to the additional expenditure on munitions. There had been an increase of over a million pounds a day on the Army, Navy, and munitions since the beginning of the financial year, but it had to be remembered that there were fourteen times as many troops on the different fronts as there were at the beginning of the war, and that the smallest increase in the different kinds of ammunition, as compared with the average in the first year, was twenty-eight fold.

Mr. Bonar Law estimated that the total expenditure for the financial year would be 2,140,000,000*l.* The total expenditure since the beginning of the war would be 4,200,000,000*l.* At the end of the financial year the total national debt would be between 3,800,000,000*l.* and 3,900,000,000*l.* Advances to the Allies and Dominions would be about 890,000,000*l.* The Chancellor of the Exchequer ended with some hopeful words about the Loan which was being closed a few days later.

Mr. Bonar Law was followed by Mr. McKenna, who criticised the Government for asking for such a large amount of money at one time. He suggested that the Government intended either that the House should not review the expenditure until June or that the money should last over what might prove to be the Parliamentary recess. Mr. McKenna then asked for a calculation of the relative cost of a Division in the Army according to whether it was employed in France, Salonica, or Mesopotamia. We had embarked upon long-distance campaigns on account of Imperial responsibilities and political relationships, and he felt sure that if the Government had a free hand they would abandon some of them. He insisted that it was the duty of the Government to take care that they were not extended one inch beyond the absolute necessities of the case.

The Report stage of the Vote of Credit was taken on February 14, and largely devoted to a discussion of the drink question. Mr. Leif Jones and others made earnest appeals for prohibition during the war, but the Home Secretary doubted whether this was the time in which they could hope to settle the old temperance controversy. He gave an account of the restrictions which the Government had imposed, and declared that the manufacture of spirits for drink in this country had practically ceased. He showed clearly that the Government

did not bind itself to the restrictions in output which had already been sanctioned.

We have already recorded the raiding of *The Field* offices on January 16. The matter was quickly brought forward in the House of Commons, and in reply to a question Mr. Macpherson announced that the Minister for War had decided to appoint a Tribunal, consisting of a High Court Judge, aided by a chemical expert as assessor, to inquire into all the circumstances which preceded and attended the raid upon Sir Theodore Cook's room. On February 15 he further announced that the Tribunal would consist of Mr. Justice Shearman and Professor W. Jackson Pope. He explained that it was the strong desire of the Government that the inquiry should be an open one.

Another subject which aroused great interest both in the country and the House in the middle of February, was the report of an interview said to have been given by Sir Douglas Haig to a correspondent of the French Havas Agency at British General Headquarters in France. The tenor of this interview was that there could be no peace without complete victory, and that this victory would be gained not merely by economic pressure, but by the infliction of defeat palpable and unquestioned in the field. Anything less than complete victory would enable German Militarism to make ready its revenge. Sir Douglas Haig was reported to have expressed the view that the decision must come upon the Western Front, and to have predicted that the decisive event would come during the present year. He had no doubt that we should break the German front. The trench war would give place to a war of movement which alone would bring us the great advantages which we expected. We had now all the munitions we wanted and were giving our Allies what they required, but we still wanted more railways and more guns, for we could never have too many guns in a war like this. Sir Douglas Haig, although represented as confident that this would be the year of decision, made no suggestion that it would also necessarily be the year of peace.

The somewhat sensational character of these predictions led to immediate questions in the House of Commons, and on February 15 Mr. Wedgwood asked whether the interview which had been reported in the Press was authorised or approved by the Government. Mr. Macpherson replied that an interview had been given, and Mr. Bonar Law added that the Government had taken steps to find out from the Commander-in-Chief exactly what had happened. On February 20 a complete statement was made of what had occurred. Mr. Bonar Law stated in reply to a question from Mr. Snowden that Sir Douglas Haig had seen various influential men, both journalists and others, from Allied and neutral countries from time to time. On the present occasion he had met several important French journalists with whom he had had a conversation in which he

gave them his general views on the situation. Proofs of the interview were sent to General Headquarters, but owing to the action of a subordinate, they were not submitted to Sir Douglas Haig himself. Asked whether the Press Bureau had consulted the War Cabinet before permitting the publication of the interview in this country, Mr. Law stated that the War Cabinet knew nothing about it until they saw it in the newspapers. Mr. Snowden then cited the King's Regulations forbidding an Officer to give interviews without permission of the War Office, and Mr. Law retorted that it had been customary both during the existence of this Government and the previous one, to allow our Allies in the case of influential representatives to see the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. The responsibility was on the General Staff who had seen the proofs of the interview. After this explanation the matter was allowed to drop.

The small group of members in the House of Commons who desired to see the early institution of negotiations for peace were able from time to time to find opportunities of stating their views in the House. Such an opportunity arose on the third reading of the Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill on February 20, when Mr. Ponsonby argued that whereas we had entered the war for the protection of small nationalities we seemed to be prosecuting it for the expansion of large empires. Mr. Snowden subsequently referred to the Bye-Election at Rossendale as evidence that those who demanded peace by negotiation represented a considerable body of opinion in the country. He expressed the belief that 25 per cent. of the average opinion in all the constituencies was in favour of peace by negotiation. The arguments of the Pacifists were answered by Mr. Bonar Law who asked what other method there was of saving the liberties of the country, except by fighting for them. He declared that we had entered the war with great misgivings and with the strongest desire to keep out of it. We were not fighting for additional territory, nor even for a glorious victory which would reflect credit on our armies. What we were fighting for was to make the class that had committed this crime realise that it did not pay. He would be glad to see a League of Peace, but the question for us now was one of life or death. He ended with the remark that he could not understand how any British citizen could put life into this sort of agitation when the greatest of the neutral nations had recognised the difference between right and wrong. The reception accorded in the House to Mr. Bonar Law's speech showed the strong feeling which prevailed against the small Pacifist minority.

For some time past there had been much discontent, owing to the taking over of private houses and other buildings, to be used as Government offices. The immense increase of official work involved by the war, and the creation of new offices, doubtless involved an immensely increased accommodation within a

limited area in London ; and it was inevitable that the drastic methods by which such accommodation had to be secured should be unpopular among those who were threatened with ejection. On February 15, Lord Midleton called attention to the matter in the House of Lords, saying that, since the pressure of the Retrenchment Committee had been relaxed, there had been an uncontrolled orgy of expenditure. He declared that in the last two years there had been taken up for the benefit of the Government in London alone, eight hotels, two clubs, a town hall, and fifty other buildings, not to speak of the wooden buildings which had been erected all over the Metropolis. The office accommodation and the staff had been more than doubled. He was informed that the staff in the Munitions Department had within two months risen over 100,000. Lord Midleton cited specific instances in which he held that the ejections carried out by the Government had been unnecessary or unreasonable.

Lord Curzon replied for the Government. He admitted that the Government had been the parent of a numerous offspring, but suggested that it was healthy and useful. In answer to Lord Midleton's specific instances he declared that there were many cases in which buildings and rooms were grossly overcrowded by men working in the public interest. There were more congested districts in London in connection with war services than in Ireland. Still, the Government were fully conscious of the danger, and investigations were being made not only by Sir Alfred Mond's Accommodation Committee, but by a Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir Compton Rickett, which was dealing with the question of staffs. In the course of this discussion Lord Balfour asked the Government whether any limit was put on the number of high-power motor-cars placed at the disposal of Army Officers. Lord Derby in reply read an Army Order forbidding the use of a car on any but strictly military duty, or on any journey exceeding forty miles where railway facilities existed, without the authority of the General Officer Commanding. The same authority was required to allow any lady or other unauthorised person to travel in a car.

We have now to turn to a subject which had obtained a remarkable amount of public attention for some months past—namely, that of venereal disease. The urgency of the subject was brought before the public by the Report of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases (*v. A.R.*, 1916 Public Documents, p. 27). The changing manners of the times now permitted this subject to be freely discussed ; and the certainty that war would greatly aggravate the evil led to the introduction of a new Bill into Parliament. It was called the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, and was introduced by the Home Secretary in the House of Commons on February 15. It provided for punishment of acts of indecency with girls under 16 by hard labour for not exceeding two years. The same penalty was imposed on any

person who, while suffering from venereal disease, had sexual intercourse with another person, unless he or she had reasonable grounds to believe that the disease had been cured. Further prohibitions were instituted against indecent advertisements.

A frank discussion took place on this Bill during its second reading in the House of Commons on February 19. Sir George Cave admitted that the case might be easily exaggerated; and he did not believe that this country was worse than other countries. He defended the proposal, included in the Bill, for increasing the penalties on keeping disorderly houses, and cited the case of one woman who made 17*l.* a day by this traffic, and of another who had deposited over 2,000*l.* in her bank in six months. He hoped that magistrates would use the penalty of imprisonment, where necessary, in such cases. As to the penalties for the communication of venereal disease, there might be difficulties in bringing the offence home to those who were guilty of it. It would be necessary to see how the Bill worked.

Sir Herbert Samuel welcomed the provisions with regard to the communication of disease. He argued that they would lead persons suffering from disease to take steps to get cured at one of the centres of treatment established under the auspices of the Local Government Board. He regretted, however, that the Home Secretary had not seen his way to raise the age of consent. The second reading was then carried.

The old question of Tariff Reform was once again revived on February 20 by the publication of three Resolutions passed by the Committee on Commercial and Industrial Policy, of which Lord Balfour of Burleigh was Chairman. These Resolutions adopted without reservation the principle of Imperial Preference. They ran as follows:—

“1. In the light of experience gained during the war we consider that special steps must be taken to stimulate the production of food-stuffs, raw materials, and manufactured articles within the Empire, wherever the expansion of production is possible and economically desirable for the safety and welfare of the Empire as a whole.

“2. We are therefore recommending that His Majesty’s Government should now declare their adherence to the principle that preference should be accorded to the productions and manufactures of the British Overseas Dominions in respect of any customs duties now or hereafter to be imposed on imports into the United Kingdom.

“3. Further, it will in our opinion be necessary to take into early consideration, as one of the methods of achieving the above objects, the desirability of establishing a wider range of customs duties, which would be limited or reduced on the products and manufactures of the Empire, and which would form the basis of commercial treaties with Allied and neutral powers.”

These Resolutions indicated a great change in the attitude

of many public men towards the question of Tariff Reform. The Resolutions were signed by life-long free-traders such as Lord Balfour and Mr Wardle, as well as by well-known champions of Tariff Reform such as Mr. Hewins. The unanimity which appeared to have been reached by parties which had formerly been so hostile to one another was however coincident with a considerable diminution of public interest, and it was not for some weeks that the matter was debated in Parliament.

Considerable anxiety was felt, in the course of February, as to the German submarine menace, and every effort was made to stimulate the Government to the discovery of new and more efficient weapons for coping with so serious a danger. On February 13, Lord Beresford opened a debate on the subject in the House of Lords. He expressed his regret that the Government had not taken the public more into their confidence. The Germans knew exactly what our position was, and he believed that if people here knew the facts there would be no question of panic. But he did not deny that we had got a bad time to face. The loss of the cargoes was a serious matter, and if the food scarcity of Germany was as bad as it was represented to be, we should see one of the worst famines in the history of the world between April and June. Lord Beresford declared his absolute faith that the present Board of Admiralty would successfully combat the submarines. The Germans, he added, wanted to starve us, but they would never be able to do so, nor would they frighten us.

The reply on behalf of the Admiralty was made by Lord Lytton, who insisted that the Germans should learn the answers to Lord Beresford's questions by experience on the sea and not by speeches in Parliament. He said that there was no one sovereign remedy for clearing the seas of this pest. As for specific naval measures the supply of mines had been very largely increased and the greatest effort was being made to obtain the largest possible number of destroyers. Although, Lord Lytton continued, this new phase of the submarine campaign was only a fortnight old, the counter measures which had been taken had already achieved very considerable success—a success that was sufficient to justify a very large measure of confidence in the effectiveness of the steps which were being taken. In the end, however, success in this last phase of the war would depend upon the co-operation of the civil population. It was an absolute condition of our success that the whole available cargo supplies of the available ships should be given up to absolute necessities only.

Later in the debate Lord Curzon gave the House much new information on the subject. He made a comparison between the number and gross tonnage of British merchant vessels of over 1,600 tons in July, 1916, and on January 31, 1917. This comparison showed that the net loss from all

causes in the mercantile marine amounted to only from 5 per cent. to 6 per cent. of the gross tonnage. New devices were being perfected which would enable the Government to look with increasing confidence to the future. He admitted that the drastic reduction of imports which he had foreshadowed would impose a great strain on some of the trades in this country, in a way that would react upon every individual citizen. Referring to the steps which had been taken to meet the new submarine campaign, Lord Curzon stated that the number of armed merchant vessels had increased in the last two and a half months by from 40 per cent. to 50 per cent. The Government were endeavouring to provide for the security of neutral shipping. They had signified their willingness to pay increased freights to those vessels, to provide special insurance facilities against risks, to offer premiums to their crews, and if necessary and where possible to purchase the ships outright. A large programme of shipbuilding was being undertaken, and every effort was being made to secure extra shipping by arrangement with the Dominions and Dependencies and with Allied and neutral states. The carrying capacity of our mercantile marine had been increased by 500,000 tons by sanctioning deck loads. The productivity of labour was being raised by the introduction wherever possible of piece-work and payment by results. Finally Lord Curzon declared that he was engaged with his colleagues in the Government in working out a new scheme for a further considerable restriction of imports and the total prohibition of non-essential commodities now coming into the country.

The announcement as to the reduction to be made in imports was awaited with great eagerness by the public. The steps to be taken were announced by Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons on February 23, and a proclamation giving effect to his proposals was published in the *London Gazette* on the same day. Mr. Lloyd George began his speech in the House by expressing his view that the ultimate success of the Allied cause depended on the solution of the tonnage difficulties with which we were confronted. Accordingly three main policies had to be adopted. In the first place drastic new restrictions must be imposed on imports which were not essential to the prosecution of the war. In the second place production at home must be stimulated to its utmost capacity by a bold and comprehensive programme of State assistance. Finally there were to be restrictions at home, including a further cutting down of alcoholic liquors. The Prime Minister reminded the House that the reduction in the amount of tonnage entering British ports was not due to submarines so much as to the fact that a very large proportion of our ships had been allocated to the Allies. But it must not be forgotten that the command of the sea had never been absolute. The Government were hopeful of finding means of dealing effectively with the

German submarines, but they would be guilty of criminal folly if they rested their policy on a tranquil anticipation of being able to realise that hope. He made a special appeal to labour to agree to the introduction of payment by results in the shipbuilding yards in order that the greatest possible output might be secured. Mr. Lloyd George next passed to the question of home production. The article of greatest bulk which consumed our tonnage was timber. A saving could only be effected by increasing economy, and by making the Army in France and this country self-supporting. The French Government had already placed two forests at the disposal of our Army, and he feared he would have to appeal to them to make greater sacrifices in this direction. As for this country, we had got the woods, and he hoped that when the appeal was made to woodmen and foresters to enrol themselves in the new army, employers and workmen would give all the help in their power. A similar plan was described for the saving of tonnage consumed by the imports of iron ore. In this case, too, we had mines and needed only to increase the labour.

Mr. Lloyd George insisted, however, that the production of food supplies was more important than that of either timber or iron ore. He deplored the indifference which the State had shown in the past to the importance of the agricultural industry, and said that this mistake could never be repeated. He wanted the country to know that our food-stuffs were low—lower than they had been within recollection. It was imperative that more food should be grown at home. The greatest obstacle to taking immediate action was the timidity of the farmer when it came to cutting up his pasture. The Prime Minister then announced a far-reaching scheme of State assistance. Minimum prices were to be guaranteed to farmers for wheat and oats, namely: for wheat, 60s. a quarter for 1917, 55s. a quarter for 1918-19, and 45s. a quarter for 1920, 1921, and 1922; for oats, 38s. 6d. for 1917, 32s. for 1918-19, and 24s. for 1920, 1921, and 1922. A minimum of 6*l* a ton for potatoes was to be guaranteed during the coming season, and a minimum wage of 25*s*. a week was to be fixed for agricultural labourers in Great Britain. Landlords, moreover, were not to be allowed to raise rents, except with the consent of the Board of Agriculture. These exceedingly drastic proposals were well received by the House, as also was the further statement that powers were to be given to the Board of Agriculture to enforce cultivation.

The next question to which Mr. Lloyd George turned was that of effecting a saving of tonnage by restriction of the import of non-essential commodities. Total prohibition was placed upon the import of a number of articles. These included apples, tomatoes, and certain raw fruits; aerated mineral and table waters, coffee and cocoa; many manufactured articles, rum, printed posters, paper-hangings, and certain kinds of foreign printed matter, such as books and periodicals. On other articles

the import was not to be entirely prohibited, but merely reduced. These included paper and paper-hanging materials (reduced by 50 per cent.); oranges, bananas, grapes, almonds, and nuts (reduced to 25 per cent. of the imports in 1915); canned salmon (reduced by 50 per cent.); Indian teas, meat, wines, and spirits (75 per cent. on the 1913 basis); and leather, raw hides, boots, bottles, timber, and iron ore. While on the subject of paper, Mr. Lloyd George paid a tribute to the newspapers which he declared had been of enormous assistance in the effective waging of the war, and which had contributed largely to the success of the recent War Loan. At the same time Mr. Lloyd George desired to prepare the public for smaller newspapers. Several of the restrictions on food were possible, because there were already large stocks in this country as in the case of coffee and cocoa. The Government considered, moreover, that we could to a much greater extent depend upon home-grown meat, of which we had a larger stock in this country than ever before. A considerable number of articles of luxury would have to be stopped. The Prime Minister expressed his very deep regret at having to take this step, but defended it on the ground of necessity. In cases where attempts were made by speculative buying of supplies to raise prices above the level at the present time, the Food Controller would assume the entire control of supplies and prices. Mr. Lloyd George explained that the severe restrictions upon alcoholic liquor were not imposed as a temperance measure, but purely to divert to food-stuffs large quantities of material which were being used for the manufacture of beer. Finally he appealed to the nation to take the measures which he had announced as a whole, and to shoulder these new sacrifices with an unflinching and ungrudging heart.

Mr. Runciman opened the debate on the proposals of the Government. He agreed that the sacrifices which had to be made would press on our people in many quarters, but contended that they would be nothing like so serious as compulsory rationing. He also made a reference to the newspaper restrictions which, he said, had been taken in very good part. Without the Press there would be practically no expression of public opinion throughout the country during the war. Mr. Long replied on behalf of the Government, and declared that too much honour could not be paid to the Crown Colonies and the Dominions for the extreme generosity and goodwill which they had displayed. Finally, Mr. Wardle assured the Prime Minister that labour would not fail to respond to his appeal. At the end of Mr. Wardle's speech, the House adjourned. Throughout the country the Prime Minister's proposals were received with remarkable equanimity.

The Navy estimates afforded another opportunity in the House for a discussion of the German submarine menace. Sir Edward Carson, who introduced the estimates on February 21, declared that it was his duty to tell the House and the country

the whole extent of the menace. He admitted that it was serious and had not yet been solved. No certain remedy existed or probably would exist, but he was confident that in the development of measures which had been and were being devised, its seriousness would by degrees be greatly mitigated. He proceeded to explain what the Admiralty had done by way of organisation.

First, there had been established at the Board of Admiralty an Anti-Submarine Department, composed of the most experienced men serving at sea. Every member of the Fleet had been invited to send in suggestions for dealing with this difficult question. Next there was the Board of Inventions, under Lord Fisher, with whom were associated some of the greatest men of science in the country. During the last two months the number of armed merchant ships had increased by 47.5 per cent. and the proportionate increase was growing each week. In the case of attacks upon armed merchantmen, about 75 per cent succeeded in escaping, whereas in the case of attacks on unarmed merchantmen only 24 per cent. were able to resist attack successfully. Sir Edward Carson then submitted for purposes of comparison the number of British, Allied, and Neutral vessels of over 100 tons lost through submarines and mines during the first eighteen days of December, January, and February. For December the figure was 118 vessels, amounting to 223,122 tons, for January 91 vessels, amounting to 198,233 tons, for February 134 vessels, amounting to 304,596 tons. The estimated number of ships in the "danger zone" at any one time was 3,000. Between February 1 and February 18, 6,076 ships of over 100 tons had arrived in our ports and 5,873 had sailed. He had not yet heard of a single sailor who had refused to sail.

Sir Edward Carson then announced a change in the method of publishing our losses. He proposed to publish as nearly as possible every day not merely the vessels sunk, but the arrivals and sailings of merchant vessels of all nationalities of over 100 tons. He also proposed to publish the number of British merchant vessels which were attacked and escaped. He did not propose to publish the number of neutral and Allied vessels sunk. In reply to a question as to why he did not also publish the number of German submarines which had been destroyed, he gave various reasons in favour of the maintenance of secrecy, and emphasised the difficulty of distinguishing certain from probable and even possible sinkings. Finally, he explained that the shipbuilding programme of the year was largely one for making good losses in the mercantile marine. Referring to the efforts of the men in the shipbuilding yards, he said that every rivet put into a ship was a contribution towards the defeat of the murderous weapons of the Hun.

The speech of Sir Edward Carson was followed by a short debate, in the course of which Mr. Churchill pleaded that Lord

Fisher should be given more responsible work. The reply to this speech was made when the House resumed the debate on the Navy estimates on February 26. Sir Hedworth Meux then took the opportunity to renew a protest which he had already made against the agitation for the replacing of Lord Fisher at the Board of Admiralty. He charged Lord Fisher with removing Admirals from their positions at a few hours' notice, and asserted that when Lord Fisher and Mr. Churchill fell out, the former deserted like a traitor. Mr. George Lambert resented the tone of this speech and ascribed it to personal animus. He contended that the Admiralty had not taken Lord Fisher and his Board sufficiently into its confidence, and that this was one of the reasons why the submarine menace had grown to such tremendous proportions. Sir Henry Dalziel expressed the sense of the House generally, when he said that the public were getting tired of these personal discussions. No other subject of importance was raised during the passage of the Navy estimates.

Meanwhile discussion continued to be carried on with regard to Mr. Neville Chamberlain's scheme of National Service. A list of twenty occupations was issued in which volunteers were specially wanted. At the same time another detailed list was prepared of "trades and occupations of primary importance." A debate on the whole subject took place in the House of Commons on February 22, on the second reading of the Bill for establishing a Ministry of National Service. Sir George Cave, who was in charge of the Bill, gave a detailed explanation of the machinery through which Mr. Neville Chamberlain proposed to work. Since a list of the essential trades had been published the Home Secretary gave the assurance that it was not the wish of the Government to close down the unessential trades entirely. At the same time it was proposed that after a certain date no further labour between the ages of 17 and 61 should be engaged in the unessential trades without the consent of the Director-General. The Government wished it to be understood that the appeal was universal. No trade or profession was excluded. They wanted offers, not only from those who were engaged in non-essential occupations or had no occupations, but also from munition workers and those engaged in essential industries. He considered that the Government could not hope to avoid some mistakes and some putting of round men into square holes. Up to that date there had been 60,000 offers of service, or five divisions of the new industrial army.

Sir George Cave explained that the Government had decided not to include in the Bill a penalty clause for breach of the volunteer agreement. They were going to put both volunteers and employers on their honour, but they were prepared to ask Parliament for further powers if they found that volunteers were ignoring the obligations which they had freely undertaken

or that employers were penalising or dismissing volunteers without reasonable cause. He announced that the Director-General was taking power to call on employers to make returns of their employees between the ages of 18 and 60. If the Government found that there were reserves of labour which voluntary enrolment had not touched, they must try other means.

Replying to the suggestion that the Bill might be used for industrial compulsion, the Home Secretary argued that such a measure could not possibly be introduced under the Bill. Still, to remove all misgivings he was authorised by the Government to give a most definite assurance that they would not use the powers now sought for effecting transport of labour in any manner not sanctioned by the existing legislation, without coming to Parliament for specific powers. Moreover, the Government would not ask for such authority unless and until they were convinced by experience that voluntary enrolment had failed to furnish the offers of labour adequate to national needs.

The Bill was not received in a very friendly spirit; and in fact it may be remarked that the idea of national service was never popular either in the country or in the House. Notwithstanding Sir George Cave's assurances, some members still held that it gave the Government power to introduce industrial compulsion. Others, like Mr. Dillon, objected to it on the ground that it was intended to prepare the way for a compulsory scheme. He referred to it in fact as a measure for placing the whole industry of the country under the control of "rabbits" located in the "funk-holes" of London. Mr. Percy Harris insisted that it was impossible for one Minister to understand the complexities of British industry. Eventually Sir George Cave met his critics so far as to agree to inserting words in the Bill which would make it clear that it did not involve industrial compulsion. Mr. J. H. Thomas asked whether a dispute would be regarded as a justification for the transport of labour. He was informed that this was not the intention of the Government; the intention was to draw upon labour solely for military or naval reasons. A different note was struck by Sir Walter Essex, who expressed his belief that the Bill would lead to compulsion, but added that he did not think that the country would object to conscription of labour after it had sent its young men to the front to suffer and die. The second reading of the Bill was then agreed to.

On the same date Lord Newton made an interesting statement in the House of Lords on the numbers of British prisoners held by the enemy. They were approximately as follows:—

In Germany 4,500 civilian and 34,000 to 35,000 military.

In Austria 200 civilian and 2 or 3 military.

In Bulgaria, no civilian and 500 or 600 military.

In Turkey, 700 civilian and 10,800 (including 8,800 Indian) military prisoners.

Lord Newton said that the conduct of the Austrian Government had been a complete contrast to that of their German Allies. British subjects had been treated with great consideration in Austria and Hungary. He announced that the Government were about to make a far-reaching proposal to Turkey for an exchange which would affect at least 20 per cent. of our prisoners. He further declared that conditions at Ruhleben had greatly improved recently.

The situation in Ireland at the beginning of the year still remained unsatisfactory, and in the course of February twenty-eight Irishmen had been arrested and deported under the Defence of the Realm Act. This action was criticised in the House of Commons by Mr. Dillon on February 26, when he moved the adjournment of the House, to call attention to the "arrest and banishment of twenty-eight Irishmen without any charge being made against them" He declared that the Irish situation was extremely serious, and expressed the fear that it would be more full of tragedy before many months had passed In reply to Mr Dillon, Mr Duke stated that he could not tell the House the whole of the facts He affirmed that Nationalist members knew well that the men who had now been deported had been deeply involved in the conspiracy and events of Easter, 1916. He agreed that the state of Ireland was serious and had been serious ever since that time. Mr Bonar Law also spoke and argued that if the state of affairs had been correctly described by Mr Dillon, there could be no question that it was the duty of the Government to prevent another rising in the interest not only of the safety of the Empire, but of that of Ireland

One further Parliamentary event has to be recorded before the end of the month of February. On the 27th, Lord Buckmaster in the House of Lords, moved the second reading of the Solicitors (Qualification of Women) Bill, the object of which was to enable women to practice as Solicitors He pointed out that women were at present engaged in almost every occupation hitherto considered to be exclusively the sphere of men, and he asked the House not to defer consent to this measure He recalled that a woman had once sat on the Woolsack The Bill was opposed by the Lord Chancellor who announced, however, that the Government would leave the question to the judgment of the House. He regarded the proposal as a step in the wrong direction. He did not believe that the active practice of the Profession was compatible with the proper work of women as mothers. Nevertheless, the debate was wholly favourable to the Bill Lord Sumner made a speech in which he said that he could see no danger in the proposal, nor could he understand why an educated woman should be regarded as unfit to prepare a will or a marriage settlement Lord Selborne and Lord Loreburn also supported the Bill, the latter remarking that women were just as well

qualified as men to act as Solicitors. Ultimately the second reading was passed without a division.

At the end of February the Order fixing new maximum prices for potatoes in conformity with the decision of the War Cabinet was issued by the Food Controller. The prices were those which we have already recorded. A second Order issued by Lord Devonport fixed maximum prices for seed potatoes, and a third set up a new standard for the loaf. The Order prohibited the sale of bread until it was at least twelve hours old and prescribed the shapes in which it must be made. Further, it was provided that all bread should be sold by weight, and that the loaves must weigh either 1 lb. or an even number of lbs. Rolls must weigh 2 oz. Power was taken by the Food Controller's Department to weigh bread at any time within thirty hours of the completion of the baking, when exposed in the shops or in course of delivery by bakers. On the last day of the month there was some discussion of the food problem in the House of Commons. Captain Charles Bathurst announced that the Food Controller had some weeks previously appointed a Committee to consider the possible contingency of a temporary scarcity of food supplies and of the laying down of a national food ration system. A scheme for compulsory rationing had been proposed and would be put into operation if the necessity arose. On the same date the matter was under discussion in the House of Lords on a motion of the Lord Chancellor affirming the need of a greatly increased production of food in the United Kingdom. The great majority of speakers warmly welcomed the programme which had been sketched out by Mr Lloyd George. Lord Derby took the opportunity of replying to criticisms which had frequently been made to the effect that the War Office were taking men indiscriminately from agricultural and other essential fields of industry. He denied the allegation entirely, pointing out that the War Office had the most difficult task to perform, because failure on their part to get the men would mean failure to keep the divisions at full strength, which was the imperative duty of the War Office. He said that the Army authorities saw as clearly as anybody the great necessity for agricultural labour and the great danger ahead if that necessity was not met. He pointed out that the men who had recently been taken from agriculture into the Army, amounting only to 10,610 out of 30,000, had not been exempted by the Tribunals, and he commented on the number of loopholes afforded by the Military Service Acts for men to escape service. He took the view that if a man did not get through one of them the War Office were entitled to look on him as a potential soldier. It was believed that in England and Wales about 180,000 agriculturists had joined the forces. At the present moment 300,000 men of military age were employed on or about the farms of England and Wales. The War Office lent 15,000 men to agriculture last spring and 30,000 last August. At present they

were asking all the men what they were doing before they joined the colours, and they were sending back ploughmen and horsemen as fast as they could, on the understanding that they would have to return to their units, if the necessity arose, at twenty-four hours' notice. Up to the present 2,400 men had been sent back in this way. It was hoped also that before long they would have at work 5,000 German prisoners in agricultural companies to the number of 15,000 men.

Up to the end of February it cannot be said that there was any real scarcity of any particular article of food. The first intimation which the public had of any impending deficiency in this respect was given by Captain Bathurst, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Food Controller, in reply to questions in the House of Commons on March 5. He then announced that there was an unprecedented scarcity of potatoes, not merely in this country, but throughout the world ; and he declared that if the present rate of consumption continued, there would probably be no potatoes for anyone in the late spring and early summer. He suggested that people who could afford substitutes would be well advised to use them, so that the supply of potatoes for the poor might be prolonged. He gave no encouragement to the suggestion that farmers were withholding supplies with the view of obtaining an extra sovereign a ton next month, and he mentioned that in a particular district to which an inspector had been sent, the main stock had been requisitioned for the Army. Two days later Lord Devonport met in Conference representatives of the Provision Trades ; as a result of which a decision was reached to fix definite maximum prices, both wholesale and retail, for tea, coffee, butter, cheese, and lard. On March 9, it was announced that Lord Devonport had sanctioned a list of maximum importers', manufacturers', and growers' prices, drawn up by the London and Provincial Provision Exchanges. These maximum prices were to be binding within the United Kingdom for a fortnight from March 10 and were then to be again reviewed by Lord Devonport. They included the following: English bacon, 150s. per cwt., Irish, 140s., Danish, 140s., etc.; Australian butter, 218s. per cwt., New Zealand, 224s., Argentine, 214s., etc.; English cheese, 165s., Canadian, 162s., etc.; and lard, American pails, 141s. 3d., boxes, 140s. The price fixed for bacon and hams did not show much change from those recently current, but the price of cheese was lowered considerably—English Cheddar showing a reduction of 10s. a cwt.

The measures adopted for limiting the consumption of food were reinforced by a speech of Sir Edward Carson, who stated that the submarine situation threatened the food of the people to an extent that no one could have anticipated. He hinted at further drastic action in the way of restrictions, and said he believed that if the people realised that it was a question of their " sticking it out " they would all agree to do so, no matter

what the Germans did. On March 12, the Order came into effect under which bread could only be sold by weight and must be at least twelve hours old.

The introduction of the Army Estimates in the House of Commons on the 1st March furnished an opportunity to Mr. H. W. Forster to give an interesting account of the development of the British Army and to discuss the military situation. The date of the discussion indeed was opportune; for the great German retreat on the Ancre had just taken place. Mr Forster, however, warned the House that it was probable that the enemy had retired not merely as a defensive measure, but with the object of saving his strength for a great blow on one or other of the Allied fronts. There was every indication, he said, that the enemy would make a great effort by such a blow to gain a decision this year. He gave good news of the fighting in Mesopotamia, and reported a statement of General Maude that the remnants of the enemy forces were badly battered and would only reach Baghdad as a disorganised mob. Over 2,300 prisoners had been secured since February 24, and the Turkish losses in killed and wounded had been very heavy.

The most important part of Mr. Forster's speech, however, was that in which he emphasised the need for men. He explained that since the end of last year the numbers had been better than in the latter part of 1916; still we were approaching a stage when the competing claims of the military forces and of industry must be decided with sole regard to national as distinct from local and individual interests. We had got to maintain the vast armies we had created. We needed still more men and needed them at once. The call to duty sounded clear as a bell to every man and woman to enrol either in the fighting or in the industrial army. Mr. Forster announced that new flying schools were being established in Canada and Egypt. He gave figures showing the almost total disappearance of enteric fever in the Army. There had only been twenty-four cases in the last weekly return from France, Salonika, Egypt, and Mesopotamia. He told the House of the various measures which had been taken to effect economy in the Army. Glycerine was manufactured from the waste fat from the food of the troops. The present rate of the annual output from the food of the troops was 1,000 tons of refined glycerine, which provided charges for 12,500,000 18-pounder shells. He mentioned also that village blacksmiths had been organised so successfully that they were able to supply all the horse-shoes needed for the Army.

In the course of the debate on Mr. Forster's speech, Captain Guest advised the War Office to make more use of the native labour of the Empire. He expressed his belief that the mobilisation of the labour resources of India, Central and South Africa would be of immense benefit to troops in France.

The debate on the Army Estimates was renewed on March 5

and ranged over a large variety of topics. Mr. George Lambert suggested that the War Office should have withdrawn 10,000 men from Salonika rather than from agriculture. Sir Ivor Herbert, on the other hand, insisted that the question of the moment was the supply of man-power for the prosecution of the war. He believed that one reason why full advantage was not being attained from the Military Service Acts was because they were applied only to a section of the population instead of to the whole of it.

Mr Churchill reminded the critics of the Salonika expedition that M. Venizelos had claims of which the Allies could never be unmindful. Still, he thought the House would do well to consider this and other great war questions in secret session. After complaining that the Government had failed to make adequate use of the man-power of India and Africa, he congratulated the Prime Minister personally on the great development of railway policy in France. In a general strategic survey, Mr. Churchill doubted whether we could expect this year to obtain decisive results by mere attrition. He hoped the Government would not commit its armies to attrition on a gigantic scale, unless they were absolutely certain they could pursue it to a decisive point.

Mr. Dillon then caused some excitement by reading from the German newspapers what purported to be a private letter from Lord Hardinge to Sir George Buchanan, the British Ambassador at Petrograd. The letter, which was dated July 31, 1916, deplored the retirement of M. Sazonoff during the progress of the negotiations with reference to Rumania's entrance into the war. It referred to Mr. McKenna as "narrow-minded and pedantic like all financial people," and added that "we may have to intervene to convince him" of the importance of the rouble exchange. As for the negotiations with Rumania the writer would never be convinced of their success until he had seen Rumania's declaration of war. Mr. Dillon went on to declare that, if the letter was authentic, Lord Hardinge ought to quit the Foreign Office. In reply to a question of Mr. Macpherson as to whether Mr. Dillon had obtained permission from Lord Hardinge to read this private letter to the House, no answer was made. Mr. Macpherson himself said that he would have hesitated long before reading it. On the subject of Empire man-power he stated that there were excellent battalions of native troops for employment in the various theatres of war. He announced that Lord Derby would be delighted to meet members in the Committee Room to discuss questions which could not be debated in the House. Later in the debate, Mr. Bonar Law intervened in order to reply to various questions which had been asked about Salonika. He declared that it was impossible for the Government to give any indication of their intentions, and declined to go into the merits of the expedition. He pointed out that we were engaged in a war with many Allies,

and that the policy as a whole could not be the policy of our Government alone. He expressed a doubt as to the usefulness of a secret session, and assured the House that the Allies were now carrying out a common policy in the near East.

Next day the House was engaged in the discussion of the question of pensions. Mr Bonar Law announced that, on the advice of Ministers, the Prince of Wales had resigned his position as Chairman of the Statutory Committee in view of the rearrangements of pensions work under a separate Ministry. He thought it only right to add that during the tenure of his office the Prince of Wales had taken a deep and continuous interest in all the proceedings of the Statutory Committee. In the performance of his first public duties of this nature, Mr. Bonar Law continued, the Prince of Wales had shown a zeal for the public service, and more particularly that part which related to the welfare of our soldiers and sailors, which might inspire the country with confidence as to the contributions to the national service which might be expected from him with increasing years. The House was warmly appreciative of this tribute as also of some observations in the same sense which fell from Mr. Asquith and Mr. George Barnes, the Minister of Pensions.

Mr Barnes then gave figures indicating the extent of the operations of his Department. He explained that the Ministry had charge of the following: Disabled men, 140,275; children of disabled men, 157,544; widows, 62,796; children of widows, 128,294; dependents of deceased men, 29,832. The total number on the books was 518,741. In addition to these, there were 125,000 widows who had not reached the pension stage, 65,000 men in hospitals, and the same number medically unfit. These increases brought the total number of men, women, and children up to 673,741. Admitting that the care and welfare of disabled men was the most backward part of the work, Mr. Barnes announced that he had reached an agreement with the War Office as to the precise time a wounded or invalided man should be discharged from a military hospital. The War Office undertook to keep a man as an in-patient so long as there was accommodation for him, and to give him manual curative treatment. After a man had been declared to be no longer fit, the War Office would keep him in hospital another three weeks, and would then treat him as an out-patient in his own district.

Mr. Barnes explained in detail the new Royal Warrant. He made two formal proposals in regard to the treatment and training of partly disabled men. A man was to be fined if he did not conform to the recommendations of the doctor, and he was to be attracted by the inducement of a bonus at the end of his period of training. The medically unfit, of whom there were over a hundred thousand, were not to be granted pensions but were to be put back where the State found them. In exceptional cases there would be a gratuity of 100*l*. Finally, Mr. Barnes announced that the scheme in its entirety would involve a capital

charge of 396,000,000*l.* and in the first year 25,000,000*l.* The addition made by the Royal Warrant mentioned 136,000,000*l.* of capital charge and 6,500,000*l.* for the first year. In the debate that followed this speech, the new scale was warmly welcomed, and the only criticisms were on points of detail.

It may be remembered that in 1916 the Government of India had proposed to raise fresh taxation by the increase of import duties on cotton goods entering India. In view of the opposition in this country, the British Government had not agreed to the proposed increase, and the cotton duties remained untouched. This policy, however, was now destined to be reversed. On March 5 Mr. Chamberlain announced in the House of Commons that the Government of India had proposed, in accordance with a widely expressed wish, to make an immediate contribution to the war, and they had offered accordingly to raise or bear the charges of 100,000,000*l.* of war debt; but for this purpose they required a further addition to their resources, which they proposed to obtain firstly, by a super-tax on income, secondly, by the increase of the cotton duties, and thirdly, by some minor changes. These proposals were gratefully accepted by His Majesty's Government who authorised the Indian Budget in which they were embodied. Mr Chamberlain, though not unmindful of the controversies which this question had raised in the past, appealed with confidence to those in this country who were more immediately interested not to raise objections to a measure which was necessary if India was to render to the Empire the help she desired to give.

Mr Runciman asked whether any proposal for a corresponding rise in excise duty was contemplated by the Indian Government. Mr Chamberlain replied that there was no subject on which Indian opinion was more unanimous than in reprobating excise duties. If they had insisted that a rise in the customs duty should be accompanied by a corresponding rise in the excise duty, it would have become impossible for him to secure the free gift of 100,000,000*l.* from India which was now given with the goodwill of all her people. He thought that the increase in the duty had already taken effect.

Notwithstanding Mr Chamberlain's appeal, opposition to the increase of the import duties was quickly organised by the cotton trade in Manchester. The Textile Factory Works Association, representing about 400,000 cotton operatives, met on March 6 and appointed a deputation to wait on Mr. Chamberlain at the India Office for the purpose of opposing the increase of the duties. On the same date the leading Employers' organisations met, and completed their arrangements for attending the deputation. During the discussion, complaint was made that the Imperial Government, at the instigation of the Indian Government, had departed from a well-recognised understanding that fiscal matters should be postponed until an Imperial Conference had had opportunities

of considering them, and that no opportunity had been given to people at home of stating their cases. On March 9 business on the Manchester Royal Exchange was suspended for a few minutes for the purpose of passing a resolution condemning the proposed increase of the import duties on cotton goods from 3½ per cent. to 7½ per cent. without a corresponding increase in the countervailing excise duty on cotton goods manufactured in India. The resolution was carried by 4,500 votes to 10.

The deputation from the Cotton Industry in Lancashire waited on Mr. Chamberlain at the India Office on March 12. The speakers for the deputation dwelt on the importance of the cotton industry, and the dislocation it would suffer if the difference between the customs duty and the excise duty were maintained. They contended that the protection it gave to the growing cotton enterprise in India would be a grave injustice to Lancashire. Mr Chamberlain, in reply, pointed out that the Indian competition extended to only a very small part of Lancashire trade, and that English as well as native opinion in India was unanimous in demanding that the Lancashire cotton manufacturers should no longer enjoy a position of special privilege which no other industry enjoyed in the markets of India. He stated emphatically that the Government could hold out no hope of a reversal of their decision. Such a step he said would be a calamity for India.

A large attendance of members appeared in the House of Commons when Mr Chamberlain, on March 14, moved a Resolution endorsing the policy of the Government in sanctioning the increase of the cotton duties. He reminded the House that Indian troops had fought in every theatre of the war. He contended that the utmost conceivable injury which could be done to Lancashire was nothing like what Lancashire feared. He appealed to members not to mix up customs duties with the entirely distinct question of Indian factory legislation, and answered another objection by insisting that even with the new duties the Lancashire cotton trade was treated more favourably in India than any other British industry. He declared that Lancashire was now asking for something that no Government would grant. This Act would set us right with Indian opinion and he appealed to Lancashire to rise superior to her fears, asking whether the goodwill of people who must be her greatest market was not worth something more than a paltry 4 per cent.

The case for Lancashire was then stated by Mr Barton and Sir Henry Norman. Mr. Barton moved an amendment welcoming India's war-contribution, but regretting that the provision for meeting its charges should include an alteration in the established system of duties on cotton goods. Mr. Barton asserted that Lancashire operatives, although patient people, were now in a state of exasperation through the belief that their employment had been prejudiced in favour of wealthy capita-

lists in India. As to the effect of this preference of 4 per cent., he said that at any time even half of it would decide whether the seller to an Indian merchant would get a contract or not. Sir Henry Norman who seconded the amendment spoke somewhat more strongly. He talked, in fact, of the possibility of Lancashire operatives finding the mills closed against them when they returned from the war. He contended that this was really a forced levy upon Lancashire to the Indian Loan, and he protested that Blackburn ought not to be compelled to finance the patriotism of Bombay.

The next speaker was Mr. Asquith, who rebuked those who had sought to raise contention between Lancashire and India. He could not deprecate too strongly the arraying of a sectional interest of the United Kingdom against a sectional interest of any of our Dominions or Dependencies. He told the Lancashire members that the fiscal policy of India and the other parts of the Empire would have to be determined on much broader considerations than the interests of any of the localities or industries. Although Mr. Asquith was of opinion that the cotton duties were a matter in which the interests of India ought to be given dominant consideration, he suggested that so contentious a question might very well have been reserved for the general review of our fiscal position which must be undertaken at the end of the war. Personally, he regretted that the question had been raised at this time, but he could not support the Lancashire amendment. Its adoption would be susceptible to every kind of misrepresentation, and it would be a sad thing if at such a time there was any avoidable appearance of friction or misunderstanding between India and the United Kingdom. Mr. Asquith finally suggested that the Government should add to their Resolution words making it clear that the changes in the cotton duties should be considered afresh when the fiscal relationship of the Empire was reviewed at the end of the war.

This suggestion was promptly accepted by the Prime Minister, who moved the addition of the words proposed. He explained that he had already informed the Lancashire deputation that it was the intention of the Government to review Imperial trade relations, including those between the United Kingdom and India, at the end of the war. He stated that the Government were taking special steps to enlist the resources of India in the war. He assured the House that it could have no idea of the eagerness of India to take her share in this great struggle, and every opportunity would be given to her to realise her aspirations. Mr. Lloyd George described the measure which had been taken as a great act of justice to India; and he had no doubt that we should reap in abundance the harvest of this deed of fair-play and equity. The measure had been taken at this time because the Government regarded it as an effective contribution towards the prosecution of the war. After this speech the de-

bate went forward to a division, and the Government had the satisfaction of carrying their Resolution by 265 votes to 125.

We have already referred to the plot to murder Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Arthur Henderson. The trial of the four persons charged was begun at the Central Criminal Court on March 6. The public were at first inclined to believe that the conspiracy was of so wild a character as not to have been meant seriously. The evidence showed, however, that the prisoners had endeavoured to obtain strychnine and curare for the purpose of poisoning darts which were to be fired at the Prime Minister. After five days' trial, three of the prisoners were found guilty, namely, Mrs. Wheeldon, her daughter Mrs. Mason, and her son in-law, Mason. Mrs. Wheeldon was sentenced to the maximum penalty of ten years' penal servitude, Mason received seven years, and his wife five years. Mr. Justice Low in delivering judgment said that he could imagine no worse case than that of Mrs. Wheeldon. Part of the interest of the case arose from the fact that it afforded an instance, happily very rare in this country, in which extreme anarchical opinions issued in attempts at crime and violence.

On various occasions during March debates took place in the House of Commons on the government of Ireland. The first of these was on March 7, when Mr. T. P. O'Connor moved the Resolution in favour of the confirmation upon Ireland, without further delay, of "the free institutions long promised her." He said that the alternative for the Government was that of immediate settlement or coercion. At the same time Mr. Devlin informed the Government that the Australian Senate had passed a Resolution by 28 votes to 2 in favour of Home Rule for Ireland.

An impressive speech was made by Major Redmond, brother of the Nationalist Leader, who was destined soon after to be killed while fighting in France. He besought the House to let the dead past bury its dead, and to make a new start in the relations between England and Ireland. He made a personal appeal to Sir Edward Carson to come to some arrangement with the Nationalists, and offered to go to any length to meet the objections and secure the confidence of Ulster. The case for the Ulster Unionists was then stated by Sir John Lonsdale, who had been charged to declare that in no circumstances would the Ulster Unionists consent to go under a Home Rule Parliament.

After some further debate the policy of the Government was announced by the Prime Minister. The fundamental facts, in his judgment, were that centuries of ruthless and often brutal injustices had driven hatred of British rule into the very marrow of the Irish race, and that in the North-Eastern part of Ireland the population was as hostile to Irish rule as the rest of Ireland was to British rule. Two questions therefore arose. Were the people of this country prepared to confer self-government on those parts of Ireland which unmistakably demanded it? Were

the people of this country prepared to force the population of the North-Eastern corner to submit to Government by a population with which they were completely out of sympathy?" He answered the first question in the affirmative and the second in the negative. He said that the Government were prepared to grant Home Rule immediately to that part of Ireland which clearly demanded it. They could not take any action to force Home Rule on the part of Ireland to which it was repugnant. There were two ways of arranging details, either by a Conference of Irishmen or by the setting up of a Commission to consider the adjustment that would be necessary to put these principles into operation. In order to make clear the standpoint of the Government, Mr. Lloyd George then moved an amendment welcoming any settlement which did not involve the coercion of any part of the Irish people. Although the manner of the Prime Minister was conciliatory, his speech was unfavourably received by the Nationalists.

Mr. Asquith, who spoke next, called for a united effort to throw off the Irish burden. He recognised the difficulties of the situation, and declared that the only practicable course was to invoke the interference of some outside and impartial authority and entrust to it the task of adjustment as between all the interests and sentiments concerned. He added the qualification that the decision of such a body would be subject to the final approval of Parliament.

Mr. Redmond, however, was satisfied neither with the Prime Minister's policy nor with the proposals of Mr. Asquith. After announcing that he would not enter into any more negotiations, he described the rise of the revolutionary party in Ireland and charged the Government with playing directly into their hands. He took the line that the Government were making the constitutional movement more and more difficult, and finally declared that the debate would compel the Nationalists to reconsider their position. To continue the debate, he insisted, would be futile; and he forthwith turned to his colleagues and appealed to them to withdraw and take counsel as to their next step. This appeal received immediate response from the Nationalist Party. Mr. Redmond walked out of the House followed by about 60 Irish Members and the remainder of the debate was carried on in their absence.

Next day a meeting of the Irish Nationalist Parliamentary Party was held at the House of Commons, and a party statement was issued. The statement declared that the position adopted by the Prime Minister involved the denial of self-government to Ireland for ever; for it laid down the principle that a small minority in the North-Eastern part of Ulster should have a veto, so long as they chose to exercise it, on self-government for a united Ireland. It accused Mr. Lloyd George of having changed his attitude on the question of Ulster, and it appealed to men of Irish blood in the Dominions and in the

United States to use all means in their power to bring pressure on the British Government to act towards Ireland in accordance with the principles for which they were fighting in Europe

No further statement was made in the House of Commons till March 16, when Mr Bonar Law warned the Nationalists of the consequences which might be entailed by their going into opposition to the Government in something like the old way. The Government of the country could not be conducted at a time like this with the ordinary methods of Parliamentary opposition. It might happen, he added, that the Nationalist action would have the deplorable effect of compelling an appeal to the country, and of having it largely on the ground that the Nationalist Members would not let the Government get on with the war. He reminded the House that the Prime Minister would be glad to appoint a Commission if there was any hope of its leading to a good result. Since the last debate the Government had received no communications from any of the parties in Ireland, but they were still considering whether any action on their part was possible.

Advantage was taken of the second reading of the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill by Sir Henry Dalziel to initiate a fresh debate on the Irish position, by proposing a Resolution calling upon the Government to take such steps as might be necessary to secure a settlement. In the course of this debate Lord Hugh Cecil argued that there would be a better chance of settling the question in time of peace than in time of war. The Home Rule case was strongly argued by Mr. Herbert Samuel, and a fresh pronouncement was then made by Mr Bonar Law, which it was felt materially eased the situation. Mr Bonar Law pointed out that the difficulty was not in convincing the people of Great Britain but lay in Ireland itself. He took the responsibility of saying that the feeling in Ulster had been changed a little and would not be found so adamant, on account of the fact that all British Parties had openly stated that there was no question of forcing a settlement on the people of the Province. He said that if the Nationalist Party could openly avow that they were prepared to act in the same spirit as British Parties it would be found easier to make arrangements with Ulster. He then frankly admitted the need for a change. The Government, he repeated, were prepared to give Ireland self-government to-morrow where it was distinctly demanded. What was wanted was a settlement, but the sacrifices would have to be on all sides if a settlement was to be obtained. He announced that the Government had decided that, in spite of the risks, it was worth while for them to make any attempt to secure a settlement in some way or other on their own responsibility. He asked the House not to press him to say any more at the moment but to give the Government time. This announcement was well received by the whole House, and general

agreement was expressed with Mr. Asquith's statement that it was better to make the attempt and fail than not to make it at all. The proposals of the Government were not formulated till April. They will be described later.

Public opinion during March was largely taken up with a discussion of the report of the Dardanelles Commission, a full summary of which appears in the Public Documents section. The report, as will be there seen, covered the period down to the end of March, 1915, during which the conduct of the war was virtually in the hands of Mr. Asquith, Lord Kitchener, and Mr. Churchill, with the assistance of certain experts. It showed that the War Office and Admiralty had often been in sharp, and at least once, critical disagreement. The Prime Minister's War Council, which should have co-ordinated them, had been characterised by formal discussions which, according to one of the witnesses, left "a very indistinct idea of any decision having been arrived at at all." The Commission particularly expressed astonishment that there had been no meeting of the Council whatever between March 19 and May 14, two of the most eventful months in our history. It appeared that the project of the attack on the Dardanelles had emanated originally from Mr. Churchill, and had been at first rejected by the War Council. In January it was agreed that the Admiralty should prepare a naval expedition in the following month. Lord Fisher had regarded this decision with misgiving, without, however, condemning the attack on the Dardanelles, and by February 16 the War Council was finally committed to the employment of troops on a large scale. Lord Fisher was criticised on the ground that he did not seriously protest against the expedition, and the report affirmed that Lord Kitchener likewise had failed to realise "the actualities of the situation." The main responsibility, however, was placed upon Mr. Asquith, who alone had the power to enforce the fullest scrutiny of dangerous experiments. Although he knew of the misgivings of the sailors, he neither insisted on eliciting their views nor even encouraged them to speak. *The Times* referred to the report as "a tragic record of drift, disorganisation and ultimate disaster for which the blame in chief must be placed on want of leadership in the head of the Government."

It was natural that great excitement should be produced in the country by the issue of so uncompromising a report. Mr. Asquith requested the Government to publish the evidence upon which the findings of the Dardanelles Commission were based. Mr. Bonar Law pointed out that the Commissioners did not recommend this course, because parts of the evidence dealt with military and naval considerations which could not be published without serious detriment to the public interest. He made it clear also that the Cabinet had been responsible for certain excisions in the report made on the representation of the Foreign Office, the War Office, and the Admiralty. It was not until

March 20, however, that a debate on the whole subject took place in the House of Commons.

Opening this debate, Mr. Asquith disclaimed any intention of attacking the Government. He contended that the publication of the report without the evidence entailed the risk of grave injustice to individuals. He referred to the opinion of the Commissioners that for the first four months of the war the machinery was both clumsy and inefficient. The only reason for the presence of experts on the War Council had been to give the benefit of their advice to the lay members, and he had never found them the least reluctant to do so. As for the Cabinet, it had never abdicated its ultimate authority in his time, though it was content normally to delegate the active conduct of the war to the War Council.

Mr. Asquith then passed to a vigorous defence of Lord Kitchener against the animadversions made in the report upon his administration of the War Office. The decision to have a naval operation alone was taken because Lord Kitchener clearly proved that he had not a sufficient number of troops available for a joint operation. He asserted further that the Government, backed by the whole naval expert opinion, were perfectly justified in saying that it was a practicable thing. Dealing with his "serious omission" in not summoning a War Council between March 19 and May 14, 1915, Mr. Asquith complained that the Commission had not called his attention before to this supposed breach of duty. His reply was that the operations after March 19 involved no new departure in policy, and that at eleven out of thirteen Government meetings held during this period the operations were brought up for report. Finally, he insisted that to describe the Dardanelles Expedition as a tragedy and catastrophe was a complete perversion of the case. He claimed that it had absolutely saved the position of Russia in the Caucasus, delayed for months the defection of Bulgaria, kept at least 300,000 Turks immobilised, and was one of the contributory causes of the favourable development of events in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia.

Mr. Churchill subsequently rose to reply from his own point of view to the criticisms of the Commissioners. He complained that the report consisted of clippings and snippets from the documents and evidence before the Commission. Defending his share in the inception of the expedition, he argued that no operation had ever been more carefully planned. He took all responsibility for the advice given by the Admiralty, and refusing to shelter himself behind Lord Kitchener, claimed that he had Lord Fisher's support. Mr. Churchill argued at length that many more important things, such as the sending of the Fleet to its war station on July 29, 1914, had been decided with a less thorough marshalling of authority.

The reply on behalf of the Commissioners was given by Mr. Clyde, who explained that he and his colleagues had

already heard Mr Churchill's arguments before. Mr Clyde showed the impossibility of publishing the evidence, and pointed out to Mr. Asquith that it was not for the author of the Commission to complain that the Commissioners had carried out their statutory instructions by presenting their report to Parliament. He asked the House to believe that, in giving extracts from the evidence, the Commissioners had done better than by merely presenting their own conclusions from it. Finally, he asked whether they were not bound to say exactly what they had gathered from the evidence in regard to the actions of Lord Kitchener. The debate ended without any Ministerial statement being made.

On the following day, a brief statement on the Dardanelles Report was made by Lord Fisher in the House of Lords. When our country, he said, was in great jeopardy, it was not the time to tarnish great reputations, to asperse the dead, and to discover our supposed weaknesses to the enemy. He therefore would not discuss the report. He would await the end of the war, when all the truth could be made known. Lord Fisher, having pronounced these three sentences, immediately left the chamber. Thus ended all official discussion of this important document, which furnished to the public so interesting a historical insight into the conduct of the war.

CHAPTER II.

THE SUMMER MONTHS

DURING the course of the spring it became clear that the determined prosecution of the war would make demands upon the organisation of society much greater than had hitherto been anticipated. The difficulties caused by lack of consideration in relation to recruiting were evidenced by a letter from Lord Northbrook to *The Times* in the middle of the month, when he pointed out the unwisdom of any general demand for the services of men with experience in ploughing in districts where the supply of farm labour was already insufficient to prepare the arable land for the sowing of spring corn.

The whole question of National Service was taken up towards the end of the month in a campaign for a National Service Week, when the Director of National Service issued a summary of his scheme, in which it was explained that the object was to form a register of willing workers on which every one was asked to enrol, whether of military age or not. The volunteers were to continue at their previous work until called up. The minimum wage of twenty-five shillings was to be paid, or the rate current for the work in the district where the man was placed. Arrangements were made for subsistence and out-of-work allowances, and also that any men who thought that they had cause for complaint should have the right to appeal.

On the thirteenth of the month an important statement on the mastery of the air was made in the House of Commons by Mr Macpherson, the Under-Secretary of State for War. It was admitted that the situation in the air on the British Front was still undecided, and also that machines were being used which were not up to the latest standard, but the War Office was using the best machines available at the time. It was stated that the amount of work done by the British Flying Corps had been greatly superior to that undertaken by the Germans. The speech ended with the statement that complete mastery of the air had not, at any time, existed on the Western Front, but that there was every reason to hope that the British would succeed in keeping the upper hand.

Another question which was discussed on the same occasion in the House of Lords was the second reading of a Bill to deprive enemy peers and princes of British titles. Lord Lansdowne declared that the only reason for dealing with the question was the satisfying of public opinion outside Parliament. This public opinion objected also to the wearing of British orders and decorations by Germans and other enemies who were fighting against us, but he urged that it would be so improbable that enemy persons would wear such decorations that it would be foolish to deal with this part of the case. The Bill was read a second time.

During the course of the month the financial situation attracted a certain amount of attention, and a vote of credit for 60,000,000*l* to meet unforeseen items of expenditure was moved (Australian wheat, 18,000,000*l*; advances to the Allies and Dominions, 23,000,000*l*; munitions and shipbuilding, 19,000,000*l*). The vote brought the total amount voted in the financial year 1916-17 to 2,010,000,000*l*. The Chancellor of the Exchequer pointed out in the course of his speech that the expenditure on the munitions account should be a cause of satisfaction, as it meant that the deliveries were being kept more exactly to contract. He stated also that the Government were getting merchant ships more rapidly than they had expected. A few days later the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in answer to a question, gave some interesting figures with reference to the rate of National expenditure, which was working out at an average of approximately 6,000,000*l* a day, but was rising, as, during the last six weeks of the year, it would average 7,260,000*l* a day, the nominal total of the National Debt at the close of the year was estimated at 3,900,000,000*l*, while 964,000,000*l* is due to this country in respect of advances to the Allies and Dominions.

An event of very great importance in the development of the constitutional system of the Empire occurred in the course of March; *viz*, the first meeting of the Imperial War Cabinet. This differed essentially from the previous meetings of the Imperial Conference in that it possessed executive powers and

was invested with responsibility for the decision of matters essential for the prosecution of the war, and was also to consider Imperial policy as to terms of peace. The Prime Ministers of Canada, South Africa, Newfoundland, and New Zealand attended, and also the Secretary of State for India, advised by the Lieut.-Governor of Agra and Oudh, Sir S. P. Sinha, the first Indian member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and the Maharaja of Bikanir representing the ruling chiefs. The Australian Representatives were unfortunately prevented from attending by political complications at home. At the same time the Imperial Conference, of which the membership was larger and which discussed similar objects to those which had been considered by former Imperial Conferences, in order to clear the ground and ensure for the Representatives of the Dominions and of India the advantages of deliberation in common, held a preliminary meeting at the Colonial Office, when the Colonial Secretary, in the chair, referred specially to the position of the Indian Representatives, this being the first time that India had been represented otherwise than by Officials of the Indian Office.

The war had caused a great deal of attention to be paid to the weak points in the British Organisation of Commerce as compared with that of Germany. One of the most important steps to deal with these defects was announced by the President of the Board of Trade at a luncheon given on March 20 by the Association of Chambers of Commerce. He stated that perhaps the most important of the post-war problems was the relation of Capital and Labour. It would not be possible for this country to revert to the old conditions, and it would be necessary, and, in the long run, advantageous that high wages should continue after the war. In order to promote the development of trade, he proposed to establish a British Trade Corporation whose principal object would be to form a Trade Credit Bank, for the purpose of developing British trade abroad. This institution was to be given a Charter, and was not to interfere with the operations of the British Joint Stock Banks or any British or Colonial Banks, but would do things for industry and trade which the present English Banks were not capable of doing. It was proposed to attach to the new Corporation an information bureau and intelligence department, capable of examining new projects. In the same speech the President stated that the Board had arranged for a great development of their commercial trade intelligence department in the City, and were going to extend the system of trade commissioners throughout the Empire, so that the whole Empire would be covered by our representatives.

Towards the end of the month an official welcome to the Russian Revolution was given by the Prime Minister in a message to Prince Lvoff, the Russian Prime Minister, in which he said that it was with sentiments of the most profound satis-

faction that the peoples of Great Britain and of the British Dominions had learnt that their great Ally, Russia, now stood with the nations which base their institutions upon responsible government. He went on to say that the Revolution in Russia had revealed the fundamental truth that the war was, at bottom, a struggle for popular government as well as for liberty. The Revolution was the sure promise that the Prussian military autocracy would, before long, be overthrown.

An important debate took place at the very end of the month on the British Blockade of Germany, in which the opener, Mr. Hewins, insisted that the Blockade was one of the main branches of war activity. He indicated that the importance of the Blockade so far had been overlooked, and that it had many weak spots. He declared, for instance, that the policy of agreement with neutral countries was exceedingly unpopular. A subsequent speaker submitted an argument in favour of a new European doctrine that no supplies by sea might enter or leave the territory of Germany and her Allies. In reply, Lord Robert Cecil, the Minister for Blockade, defended the measures which had been taken, and argued that the rationing of neutral countries by agreement was a better method than compulsory rationing. He claimed that for some months there had been a complete cessation of oversea importation into enemy countries. At the same time, he agreed that there still remained the difficult question of home-production of the border neutrals, and he had come to the conclusion that the only way in which they could stop trade with Germany in the produce of these neutral countries, was by making a bargain with them that they should restrain their trade with our enemies in consideration of our granting them the goods they wanted from us. He ended by declaring that the Blockade had caused a very great scarcity of food in Germany, and a considerable scarcity of wool, cotton, leather, lubricants, and other necessities.

The House of Lords debated the subject the same night, when Lord Hylton, replying for the Government, declared that the evidence indicated that the result of the Blockade was not unsatisfactory.

A very grave statement on the urgency of the man-power problem was made by Mr. Bonar Law in moving the second reading of the new Military Service Bill on March 29. The Bill provided for a new examination of discharged and rejected men, and Mr. Bonar Law stated that it was an absolute necessity in view of the present military situation. The recruits who had been obtained since the beginning of the year had fallen short of the number estimated by 100,000. Steps had been taken to make the deficiency good by the taking of fit men from behind the lines for the fighting line, and also by the greater use which was being made of the services of women,

but a deficiency still existed, and the new Bill would enable the military authorities to deal with a million discharged or rejected men from among whom they estimated that at least 100,000 recruits could be obtained within the next three months. The measure would impose hardship on individuals, but the war had reached such a point that every man who was found fit to go into the fighting line must be there, unless his services were required for national needs of equal importance at home. He gave the assurance that the Army Council would do their best not to take men who were not fit for service, and that no unnecessary inconvenience would be given to the men liable under the Bill.

Mr. Hogge at once moved an amendment, which was supported by Mr. Asquith, designed to secure pensions for men discharged from the Service owing to disability not caused by wilful misconduct. Mr. Bonar Law promised to ask the War Office whether it was not possible to improve the medical examination so as to run no risk of danger of the kind referred to. Although there had been in some quarters vigorous protests against this Bill, its second reading was ultimately carried by an overwhelming majority, only eighteen members voting against it.

Many people had believed that absorption in the Great War would cause a slackening in the rate of constitutional change, but their views were proved to be mistaken by the enthusiasm which greeted Mr. Asquith's speech in moving a Resolution of Thanks to the Speaker for presiding over the Electoral Reform Conference, when he proposed that legislation should promptly be introduced on the lines of the Resolutions returned from the Conference. Mr. Asquith stated that it would be criminal folly to throw away the unique opportunity afforded by one of the most remarkable concordats in our political history. He reminded the House that this matter could not be avoided during the war. There must be some electorate, which should not be a sham, to whom an appeal could be made. The part of his speech which perhaps attracted most popular attention was the statement of his change of view on the subject of Women's Suffrage. He declared that the women had worked out their own salvation during the war, which could not have carried on without them, and he felt it impossible to withhold from them the right of making their voice directly heard on a matter which would vitally affect their interests, namely, the problem of reconstruction at the end of the war.

An amendment was moved by Mr. Salter designed to limit the demand to an immediate register, and to the provision of means of voting for absent soldiers and sailors; the speaker outlined a plan which ultimately became part of the Bill for allowing soldiers and sailors to vote by proxy. He emphasised the difficulties inherent in the compromise adopted by the Electoral Reform Conference, namely, the problem of Women's

Suffrage, which still divided families and individuals, and the fact that it would be difficult to consider the franchise of one House without a review of the constitution of the other. This attack on the compromise led to a striking intervention in the debate from the Prime Minister, who declared that the achievement of the Speaker's Conference, in securing an agreed compromise was nothing short of a miracle, and that it would be a national waste if the results of the Conference were thrown away. He carried the House with him in his declaration that the soldier must have a voice in the settlement of the new conditions which would be necessary after the war, and if soldiers and sailors, why not miners and munition workers? The Prime Minister indicated that the Government had but two reservations to the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference. The proposals about proportional representation were novel and did not form an essential part of the scheme. He trusted they would not be regarded as an integral part of the compromise, as such an attitude would make the position of the Government much more difficult. With regard to Women's Suffrage, there was no doubt that the war had had an enormous effect upon public opinion. To deny women a voice in the determination of their peace-time status would be an outrage. They had made their case. The Government would leave this question to be determined by the House of Commons, but he had not the faintest doubt what the vote of the House would be. The speech ended with the prophecy of a new temper which would be created by the peace. The unity of the war period would be infused into the efforts of peace, and it would be a national disaster to throw away that unity by wrangling. Later in the debate, Mr. Walter Long also announced his conversion to Women's Suffrage, and threw out the suggestion, which was later acted upon, that the success of the Speaker's Conference might form a precedent for the reference to a similar body of the question of the Second Chamber. When the amendment was put, it was lost by 62 votes to 341. The figures were received with cheers, and the motion was finally carried without a division.

An interesting echo of the debate was found in the reception of a deputation on the following day by the Prime Minister. This deputation was curiously illustrative of the changes introduced into the life of women since the war. It was attended by representatives of women workers in all professions, trades, and occupations. There were women omnibus conductors in uniform, women police, nurses, women in khaki, women doctors, van drivers, dentists, munition-workers, oxy-acetylene welders, and textile workers. The deputation was introduced by Mrs. Fawcett, who had been for so many years the leader of the constitutional section of the advocates of Women's Suffrage. Among others who spoke were Miss Anderson, H.M. Inspector

of Factories, Miss Mary McArthur, the Secretary of the National Federation of Women Workers, Mrs. Despard and Mrs. Pankhurst, the two chiefs of what had been known as the militant suffragettes Mr. Lloyd George was asked first if the Government had promised to introduce a Franchise Bill including a measure of Women's Suffrage, and second, whether the Government intended to make Women's Suffrage an integral part of the Government Franchise Bill, and whether Government Whips should be put on in support of the principle In his reply, Mr. Lloyd George declared that the moment the Legislature began to interfere in the home, in the education of children and the health of the people, it was inconceivable that that half of the population which was most concerned with the home and with the health and upbringing of the children should have absolutely no voice at all in determining what was to be done. There was no logic, sense, or justice in that. In answer to the specific questions, the Prime Minister stated that the Government would leave the question of voting for women as an open question for the House. The proposal of Mr. Speaker's Conference would be in the Bill, and it was not possible yet to say what arrangements would be made with regard to Government Whips on any part of the Bill. The question of the age-limit, which would be 30 to 35, would be left to the House of Commons. Mr. Lloyd George warned the deputation that any amendment lowering this age-limit, which he admitted he would not dream of supporting in peace time, would be certain to ruin the Bill, and therefore he strongly urged the deputation to stand by the proposals of the Speaker's Conference and to be satisfied with these at present.

Towards the end of March a serious strike at Barrow tended for some time to hold up the production of munitions. The strike began on March 21, when a number of engineers came out. It increased during the next few days, and by the end of the month affected practically all the engineering shops in the locality. The reason was that frequent cause of trouble, the fixing of rates under the premium bonus system. A mass meeting demanded that the general rate fixer should be dismissed. The strike was not approved by the executive officials of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and allied Unions. The Minister of Labour held on the 23rd a Conference with those bodies, as a result of which a telegram was sent to the men, instructing them to resume work immediately. The officials immediately proceeded to Barrow for the purpose of influencing the men on strike, but at the mass meeting held on the Sunday, a resolution was passed rejecting their advice, and resolving that the men should stay on strike until their grievances were rectified. This incapacity of Trade Union officials to control the members of their organisations was a marked feature of the labour troubles in this and one or two previous years.

The delay caused in the production of munitions had now become so serious that the matter was referred to the War Cabinet, and a statement was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Bonar Law, declaring that the strike was regarded by the Government as a matter of the utmost gravity. A Ballot Vote of the men was taken at the end of the month, but the majority were still in favour of continuing the strike until the rectification of the grievances. The Minister of Labour then took another step. He arranged for the Executive Council of the A S E to travel again to Barrow in order that they might endeavour to persuade the men to return to work. This step, however, was no more successful than the previous ones. At last the Government took strong action, and posted notices throughout the Barrow district calling attention to the gravity of the strike in relation to the provisions of the Defence of the Realm Act, and finally announced on April 2 that unless work was resumed within twenty-four hours, steps would be taken under the provisions of that Act. The men answered by offering to send to London, for the discussion of their grievances, a deputation of shop stewards, in whom they had greater confidence than in the officials of their central organisation. The Minister of Labour replied offering to receive the deputation on condition that the men started work on the following morning. Under this pressure the men agreed to resume work, and the firm undertook to confer with the representatives of the workmen on the difficulties which had caused the strike, immediately on the resumption of work. The Minister of Labour had previously intimated to the men that he would guarantee a speedy decision on the points in dispute. Work was resumed on April 4.

The discussion on the Military Service Bill during April resulted in a certain number of modifications. It was agreed that any man who upon re-examination was not accepted on the ground that he was totally and permanently disabled should be finally discharged. The Bill passed through the House of Commons by April 3, and through the House of Lords a day later without amendment, after Lord Derby had stated that larger and far more drastic measures would have to be taken to secure men for the Army. In its final form, the Bill gave power to the Army Council to call up for re-examination (1) Territorials regarded as unsuitable for foreign service; (2) men discharged from the forces in consequence of disablement or ill-health, and officers who had ceased to hold commissions for the same reasons; (3) men rejected on any ground. Men engaged on agricultural work, if this was certified by the Board of Agriculture to be work of national importance, were excluded from the Bill, and also officers and men discharged from the Forces as the result of wounds received in battle. The necessity of the Act was shown by a speech by Sir William Robertson the day before it received the Royal Assent, in which he said that the task of the Army was so huge that it must have all the men who

could be spared from essential industries. He declared that victory could not be expected "unless and until every man and woman in the country does a full day's work of an essential nature."

An opportunity of influencing public opinion in England was given to the oversea Ministers attending the Imperial War Conference by a luncheon in their honour, held on April 2 by the Empire Parliamentary Association. The Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Robert Borden, dwelt in his speech on the size and achievements of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, which amounted to more than 300,000 men. He alluded to the dangers to the Empire produced by the submarine campaign, and the necessity of economy in order to avoid a future shortage. He declared that the aim for which the Allies were fighting was not the crushing of Germany, but that she might learn to make reparation, and to give guarantees for the future. He referred to the interesting constitutional developments which had resulted from the war, and from the summoning of the Dominion Governments to aid the counsels of Great Britain. For the first time, he said, there were sitting in London two Cabinets, one the War Cabinet, the other the Imperial War Cabinet.

"We meet there on terms of equality, under the presidency of the First Minister of the United Kingdom. We meet there as equals, although Great Britain presides *primus inter pares*. Ministers from those nations sit round the Council Board, all of them responsible to their respective Parliaments. Each nation has its voice upon questions of common concern. Each preserves, unimpaired, its perfect autonomy, its self-government and the responsibility of its Ministers to their own electorate. For many years the thought of statesmen and students in every part of the Empire has centred round the question of future constitutional relations. It may be that now, as in the past, the necessity imposed by great events has given the answer."

General Smuts spoke on the same occasion. He drew attention to the fact that the work of South Africa in the war was done by a white population, the majority of which was not British, but Dutch, and which only fifteen years previously had been locked in deadly conflict with the British Empire. What was the reason for this change? It was because the Boer War was complemented by one of the wisest political settlements ever made in the history of this nation. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman achieved a work in South Africa which had already borne, and would continue to bear, the most far-reaching results in the history of the Empire. The principles acted on in this settlement were the principles for which the British Empire stood in the struggle with Germany. Germany still believed that might was right, that a military machine was sufficient to govern the world. The fundamental issue in the struggle in which we were engaged was that the

government of the world is not military, and cannot be brought about by a military machine, but by the principle of equity, justice, fairness and equality, such as built up this Empire. He went on to state that he believed that morally and politically the German Empire was already defeated, although he could not hide from himself that the Allies had hard work in front of them, and difficult times ahead of them. General Smuts then discussed very shortly the future constitution of the Empire, and warned his hearers against relying too much on precedents. He said that the British Empire was a much larger and more diverse problem than anything seen hitherto, and the sort of constitution described in books, the sort of political alphabet elaborated in years gone by, did not apply and would not solve the problems of the future. What was wanted was the maximum of freedom and liberty, the maximum of self-development for the young nations of the Empire, and machinery that would keep all these nations together in the future years.

The organisation of National Service continued to attract attention during the month. Mr. Bonar Law declared that the Government were alive to the necessity for giving a fair chance to the scheme, on a voluntary basis, and refused to admit that the scheme, so far, was a failure. In the middle of the month the War Cabinet approved a new scheme submitted by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, the Director-General, whose object was to obtain from the less essential industries substitutes to take the place of men who must be released from the more essential industries for military purposes. Committees of employers and employed in the trades affected were being formed, in order to arrange what men should be released, and to arrange for their transfer to the places in which they would be needed. The men to be transferred were not to be required to enrol as National Service volunteers. They were to be invited to fill specific vacancies, but would receive the same subsistence allowances and other benefits as were given to other volunteers. The Reserved Occupations Committee was transferred to the National Service Department, and the new restrictions were much more drastic than any made previously. They would provide more men for the Army, as well as substitutes for men required for the more essential trades.

The inquiry on behalf of the Army Council into the refusal of the War Office to use Halakite, or to license its manufacture as an explosive, was continued during the month. The inquiry, as already stated, had been adjourned in order that a piece of apparatus necessary for the evidence should be brought from Paris, but at the meeting of the Committee after the adjournment the apparatus was still not brought. Several Government analytical chemists gave evidence, in the course of which they stated that the material was too sensitive for use in big guns, and the barrister who was representing the inventor

threw up the case on the production of the new evidence and the non-appearance of the apparatus. Mr. Justice Shearman, in concluding the public inquiry, said that without wishing to speak too strongly, he could not help suggesting that something in the nature of a fraud had been attempted to be perpetrated on the Government.

On the motion for the Easter adjournment, a number of interesting points were raised. Mr. Hogge inquired whether the Admiralty were prepared to meet sympathetically the request for an increase of pay for the ratings below leading seamen. Dr. Macnamara answered that such an addition was at present impossible, but laid stress on the amount, about three-quarters of a million a month, which was paid to the wives and children of men serving, and on the number of promotions that had been made. The Government were also appealed to by Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck to take active measures to deal with the prisoners interned in Germany. He urged that, if exchange were not possible, the Government should arrange for an agreement to send prisoners to a neutral country. Sir C. Henry drew attention in his speech to the gradual undermining of the control of Parliament, a process accentuated during the progress of the war, and to the assumption of power by officials and civil servants. He suggested the introduction of the French system of Parliamentary commissions. Mr. Herbert Samuel opposed this proposal. He declared that the whole machine of Government would be slowed down, and the burden borne by Ministers would be doubled if all proposals had to be presented to Parliamentary committees. He asserted that the ineffectiveness of the private member was due to every question being regarded as a question of confidence in the Government. At the same time, he admitted that Parliament ought to have a stronger control over matters of foreign policy and over finance. Mr. Churchill took the opportunity of the debate to make a vigorous attack upon the Government. He declared that the failure of the House of Commons to give close and severe attention to the management of the war had been responsible in the past for serious mistakes, and that the abdication of Parliament had given a disproportionate power to the Press. Already newspaper editors were given information which was withheld from the House of Commons. Referring to the institution of the Air Board, he declared that it was totally ineffective, and he blamed the House for allowing the question to be put off. Never since the Battle of the Marne had the position been so serious as it was then. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bonar Law, in replying, declared that it was much too soon to say that the arrangements of the Air Board had been a failure. If a comparison were made between the numbers and the efficiency of the machines and the men which the country possessed at that time and those which had been in existence at the end of the last campaign, it would be realised that a great deal had been done. With regard to the

control of Parliament, he agreed that it would be an advantage if some means could be found by which the House could have a more direct and a more intelligent interest in the business which was being carried on.

During the month of April the country became seriously alarmed by the losses caused by submarines. Of vessels over 1600 tons gross, eighteen were sunk during the week ending April 1, seventeen during the week ending April 8, nineteen during the week ending April 15, while for the week ending April 22, the figure rose to the alarming total of forty, and the number of ships under 1600 tons lost during the same period showed a corresponding increase. It was admitted at the end of April that the situation was extremely serious, and the country became very anxious owing to the fact that no information was given as to the amount of tonnage lost. An article in *The Times* on the last day of the month pointed out that to defeat the German submarine designs would demand very great effort, and that this maximum effort would not be forthcoming while the gravity of the position was obscured by absolutely misleading figures.

The great factor, however, to be set against this discouraging situation was the entry of the United States into the war. This was celebrated with great enthusiasm at gatherings at the Savoy Hotel on April 12, when important speeches were made by the American Ambassador, Mr. Page, and by the Prime Minister. Mr. Page stated that his country had set out to help in the enterprise of saving the earth as a place worth living in. For the first time, except when once before they came to Europe to suppress the Barbary pirates, Americans were coming to war in the Old World. They were coming for the ideal, that every human being should have the utmost possible opportunity for his individual development, and that nothing should be put in the way of that development. It was to make sure that this ideal should not now perish from the earth that America had come into the war. The Prime Minister in the course of his speech said that the advent of the United States "gives the final stamp and seal to the character of the conflict as a struggle against military autocracy throughout the world. The fact that the United States of America has finally made up its mind, makes it clear to the world that this is no struggle for aggrandisement and for conquest, but a great fight for human liberty." He went on to say that the most characteristic of all Prussian institutions was the Hindenburg Line, which was a line drawn in the territories of other people with a warning that the inhabitants of those territories shall only cross it at the peril of their lives. Europe, after enduring this for generations, made up its mind at last that the Hindenburg Line must be drawn along the legitimate frontiers of Germany. The Hindenburg Line had been drawn along the shores of America, and Americans were told they must not cross it.

Then America said: "The place for that Line is on the Rhine, and we mean to help you to roll it up." America would wage an effective and a successful war, and would ensure a beneficent peace, not a peace which would be the beginning of war, not a peace which would be an endless preparation for strife and bloodshed, but a real peace. The same tone was struck by Lord Bryce in his speech at the dinner of the Pilgrims' Club on the same evening, in which he spoke of the financial help which America could give, the ships, the vessels of war, the air-men and the soldiers which she would send to England. The American Ambassador in replying to the Toast of the "United States and the Cause of Freedom," declared that America had come in not only to save her own honour, on provocation directly done to her, but also for the preservation, the strengthening and the extension of free Government. The upheaval was colossal, but when these barbarous and personal sorrows receded, human society would be constructed better than it ever was, and on a firmer basis. He laid stress on the unity of aim in the war of the American and British nations, notwithstanding the difference of hopes, of point of view, and of social structure. He doubted if there could be another international event comparable in value to this closer association of the two nations.

When Parliament reassembled after the Easter recess, a certain amount of attention had to be devoted to the Irish question. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated in the House on the first day after the recess, April 17, that the Government were doing their best to find a solution of the Irish question. The Prime Minister had hoped to make a definite statement on the subject during that week, and would have done so had he not been unexpectedly called to a Conference on the Continent. The subject was again referred to, but again only to be further postponed, on April 26.

During the month of April the Bill for extending the life of Parliament for another six months until November 30 was passed through its remaining stages, and sent to the House of Lords. The Nationalists made a protest on the motion for the third reading, but in the end, the Bill was passed by 203 votes to 42.

A very important step had been taken by the appointment of the distinguished Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University (Mr. H. A. L. Fisher) to the Presidency of the Board of Education, and great interest was taken in his first speech in the House of Commons, when he introduced the education estimates, and sketched a broad policy of reconstruction to be carried out in the future. He declared that, contrary to expectation, the war had had the effect of producing a quickened perception of the true place of education in the scheme of public welfare and an earnest resolve to give to our national system all the improvements of which it was capable. Remarkable interest was being exhibited in education in two quarters from which a clear

note had not always been sounded. Both trade unions and the enlightened employers and manufacturers were demanding educational reform. These observations were preliminary to the proposal of a large increase in expenditure, amounting to nearly four million. One of the most important reforms was an increase in the pay of teachers. Mr Fisher declared that he regarded it as essential to a good scheme of education that teachers should be relieved from perpetual financial anxiety, and the only certain way of securing that any extra money available for education should go into the pockets of the teacher was for the State to pay the teachers direct, but he did not propose to establish the teaching profession as a branch of the Civil Service, as he feared a very great decline in the local interest in education, if the control of the teaching was withdrawn from the local authorities and vested in Whitehall. He then outlined a scheme by which the new grants would increase in comparison to the population of each area and its poverty, while it must prove that it was doing its share towards the education of the country by imposing an education rate of at least one shilling. The grant was also to be conditional on the maintenance of an adequate staff of teachers, the establishment of special schools for older scholars, the provision for teaching of handicrafts, cookery, gardening and other special subjects, and on the efficiency of the administration of the law of school attendance. He also proposed a new system of special grants for secondary schools, which were, he declared, the key to the situation, and in concluding his speech, he outlined his plans for the future, which included a development of University teaching, including post-graduate research, improvements in the education of country children, the establishment of nursery schools for children under the age of five, and better provision for the intellectual, moral and physical discipline of young persons during the period of adolescence. This vigorous statement of a complete educational policy was warmly received by the House, and Mr. McKenna gave expression to the universal opinion in congratulating Mr. Fisher on his brilliant statement.

A less pleasant subject was discussed on April 23, when the second reading of the Venereal Disease Bill, which had already passed the House of Lords, was moved in the House of Commons. Mr Hayes Fisher in introducing the Bill, said that experience showed that after-war outbreaks of the disease were certain to occur, and it was essential that no time should be lost in making provision for dealing with the matter. The Bill prevented the treatment of venereal disease otherwise than by a duly qualified practitioner, or the dispensing of any remedy except on the written prescription of such a practitioner. Such legislative action was the complement of the administrative action which had already been taken, and would hasten its operation. When the Government provided for a remedy of a scientific character, they had the right to say that people

should not go to some one who would drive in the disease. The Bill was received with some criticism, mainly on the ground that the gratuitous treatment of the disease was not yet provided, and that under those circumstances it was unreasonable to prohibit practice by unqualified men. But the whole House was in favour of the Bill, and after a certain amount of discussion, it was read a second time. During the discussion an interesting note was struck by Lieut.-Col Greenwood, who said that the neglect of the Government in looking after the Canadian soldiers on their arrival in this country had aroused deep indignation in Canada—a criticism which he hoped the Government would at once take measures to remove, he therefore welcomed this Bill as an instalment of their proposals.

During the latter part of the spring the food situation continued to need great attention from the Government. The country had been taken by surprise when it was discovered that the stock of potatoes was unusually short. It became necessary to fix prices which would otherwise have risen altogether beyond the reach of the poorer classes. On March 20 Lord Devonport issued an appeal asking the well-to-do to abstain altogether from the use of potatoes, and to adopt in their place more expensive cereals and other vegetables. Unfortunately, the run upon the substitutes soon began to send their prices up also, and it became, for instance, necessary to fix a price for swedes, since the greengrocers, in view of the scarcity of potatoes, had raised the price of swedes as high as 2d. per lb. With regard to sugar the difficulties became very marked towards the end of March. The grocers, who were obliged to eke out small supplies among, in many cases, an increasing number of customers, had worked out a rough-and-ready system of distribution in proportion to the purchases of other goods. This laid so great a burden upon the poorer classes, who could not afford to purchase large supplies of other groceries, that Lord Devonport was ultimately forced to issue an Order making it an offence to impose any condition relating to the purchase of any other article. At the same time, it was made a penal offence to sell more than a fortnight's supply to any one customer at a time. Grave warnings were also issued with regard to the use of bread. Lord Devonport in a speech in the House of Lords on March 22, said that compulsion would be a national calamity, but it might become necessary to insist on a diminution in food consumption, and he had the machinery for a compulsory system ready, although he did not contemplate using it at present. He ended his speech by appealing to the housewife, who held the key to the citadel, to bring about the necessary diminution of food consumption. The House of Commons debated the subject on the following day on a motion directing local authorities to establish dépôts for the sale of coal, sugar and other necessities. Mr. Watt, one of the Glasgow members, urged that

the Government should take over the entire control of the food supplies, and have them distributed by the local authorities. Both Mr George Roberts and Captain Charles Bathurst replied for the Government. Mr. Roberts doubted the success of a plan which imposed too great a burden on local authorities, which he thought would be the case if they were charged at that time with the purchase and distribution of necessary commodities. Captain Bathurst admitted that the situation was not altogether satisfactory, but he did not believe that the plan advocated in the motion would be successful. It would be diverting the distribution of food from its natural commercial channels and destroying a human machine that possessed an immense amount of experience and practical knowledge to set up another which possessed neither. He hoped that it would soon be possible to prevent hoarding, through the investigation of traders' books, without undue interference with the domestic hearth. He made a slight reference to the problem of the distribution of milk, which he hoped might be better organised by adopting the plan of one distribution a day. He concluded his speech by begging the House of Commons to avoid anything in the nature of a panic in the somewhat critical months ahead, and reminded them that even if the supplies of potatoes and sugar ran short the country was not going to starve. At the end of March, Lord Devonport entrusted to the National War Savings Committee the direction of the campaign on behalf of voluntary rationing, stress being laid on the importance of individual effort to make the voluntary rationing system a success. The Committee issued a memorandum of suggestions in which it argued that the system of compulsory rations in Germany had not been successful. It had produced well-fed people in the country and ill-fed people in the towns, and it had been set at naught by large and powerful classes of the community to the detriment of the others. It was at the same time urged that voluntary rationing produced a more elastic as well as a more convenient system. The campaign was first of all to be directed towards the rich, who were to be urged to leave bread and potatoes and other cheap foods to the poor, and to live themselves on the more expensive foods which are beyond the reach of all save the well-to-do. The Committee also advocated the setting up of co-operative or communal kitchens.

At the same time steps were taken to increase the food supply. Two committees were appointed to consider the means of increasing the fish supply in the home market, and for encouraging the consumption of fish cured or otherwise preserved in substitution for other foods.

During April the limitations laid by the Government on the use of food became much more drastic. The attempt to restrict consumption by curtailing the number of courses at meals was an unmitigated failure, and a new Order came into operation

on April 15. Its main provisions were (1) a weekly meatless day, Tuesday in London, Wednesday in the rest of the United Kingdom. (2) Five days without potatoes. (3) Rationing of bread and meat by bulk on a scale which allowed of two ounces of bread for each meal, two ounces of meat at breakfast, and five ounces at lunch or dinner. The Order did not apply to any public eating-place where the total charge for a meal, exclusive of charges for drinks, did not exceed 1s 3d. As the returns were to be made up in bulk each week, the more elastic provisions of this Order made it possible for the caterer to exercise his ingenuity in providing made-up dishes in which the quantity of meat was spread out by the addition of non-rationed food-stuffs. One Food Order followed another throughout the month. On April 6 came an Order against food hoarding, which prevented retailers from selling to any one person quantities in excess of the amount required for ordinary use and consumption. The Wheat, Barley, and Oats (Prices) Order, issued April 16, fixed the maximum prices for home-grown wheat, barley, and oats at respectively 78s a quarter, 65s. a quarter, and 55s. a quarter. The Cakes and Pastry Order, issued on April 18, provided that no cake should contain more than 15 per cent. of sugar, nor more than 30 per cent. of wheat and flour, and forbade the addition of any edible substance to the exterior of the cake after it had been baked. At the same time, steps were taken to deal with the undue consumption of food at afternoon tea. No customer was to be charged more than 6d., including the charge for beverages, for a meal served between the hours of three and six P.M., unless it included meat, fish, or eggs, and no individual customer was to be served with more than two ounces of bread, cake or biscuit. The Wheat, Rye, and Rice (Restriction) Order prohibited the use of these commodities except for making articles to be used for human food.

The most serious feature in the situation was the shortage of wheat. It was stated in the middle of the month that the King, Queen and Royal Household had, as an example to the nation, adopted the scale of national rations since early in February. Farmers were asked by the Board of Agriculture to take immediate steps to prepare for a reduced importation of feeding-stuffs for cattle. In a statement issued to farmers, the President of the Board said that it was essential in the present crisis to import human food rather than food-stuffs for live stock. At the same time, the War Office agreed to take no further men from agriculture than the 30,000 already ordered to be taken by the War Cabinet, and also, for the time being, to remove from agriculture no man who was below category "A". The urgency of these precautions was shown by the fact that the statistics of the world's yield of wheat for 1916-17 showed a decline of 27 per cent. below the previous two years, while the outlook for the following season was not too promis-

ing. A very serious speech on the subject was made on April 14 by Mr. Kennedy Jones, M.P., the Director of Food Economy. Mr. Jones said frankly that the situation was undoubtedly grave. The U-boat was more than a menace. It was an active and an actual danger. The shortage of tonnage, the partial failure of the world's wheat crop, the depredations of the submarine, all had combined to bring about a shortage in wheat and flour which, unless faced boldly and sensibly, might bring the country near to the edge of disaster. What he wanted to see in Great Britain were 40,000,000 food controllers, and he urged them to make the good resolve to eat one pound less bread in the course of the week than in normal times. He believed that if by voluntary methods such a reduction in the consumption of bread were obtained, the country would be able to carry through till the new harvest, would defeat the immediate aims of the German submarines, and, with America in the lists, would prevent the appearance of the grim spectre of waste.

On the 30th of the month, the Food Controller was given power to take over the flour mills of the United Kingdom, and to issue regulations and instructions as to their management. On the 25th of the month, a very serious speech was made by Lord Devonport in the House of Lords on the food danger. He warned the people with the utmost gravity that in this war food was destined to be one of the supremely decisive factors; that shipping was being depleted every day, and although the existence of the nation depended upon it, yet it was, at the moment, a wasting security. Therefore, unless special self-denial was exercised in bread consumption, it would not be possible to get through to the next harvest without severe privation. Lord Devonport confessed that he watched with growing anxiety the figures which recorded the weekly consumption of bread and the position of the reserve stocks. He recognised that there was no margin for risks, and had therefore decided to set up forthwith the necessary machinery for rationing, in order to be prepared to deal with the control and distribution of supplies of bread, sugar or any other food at short notice, if and when necessary. The speech made a deep impression upon the House, and led to a number of questions, quite in the manner practised "in another place."

Meanwhile, legislative action was being instituted to increase the native supply of food in the future, and to decrease our dependence on imports from abroad. The Corn Production Bill represented perhaps the most complete break with the Victorian system of free imports which was introduced during the first three years of the war. It provided that if the average price for wheat or oats were less than the minimum price as fixed by the Bill, the occupier of any land on which wheat or oats had been produced should be entitled to be paid for each quarter a sum equal to the difference between the average price and the

minimum price per quarter. At the same time a minimum wage for agricultural workmen was to be introduced through the setting up of an Agricultural Wages Board. The third part of the Bill imposed restriction on any raising of agricultural rents which would not have been possible had not Part I. of the Act been enforced. The Bill also gave power to enforce proper cultivation, and should the land not be used to its full extent, the Board of Agriculture might either authorise the landlord to bring the tenancy to an end, or they might bring it to an end themselves; the Board had also power to take possession of any land not in the occupation of a tenant. The Bill was remarkable because it employed at one and the same time the old-fashioned system of bounties and the modern conception of the raising of wages of underpaid labourers by legislative action. At the second reading of the Bill, the President of the Board of Agriculture, Mr Prothero, declared that if we could grow at home 82 per cent of all the food that we required for five years, we should be safe. Such a result could be attained if we added 8,000,000 acres to our existing arable area. With three-fifths of our total cultivated area under the plough, the nation would be free of the nightmare of the submarine menace. Within the United Kingdom and Ireland the arable area had already been increased by over 1,000,000 acres. The Government scale of guaranteed minimum prices was absolutely necessary for national safety, and the transaction could be described as the State going into partnership with the agricultural interest, and standing security against loss.

It was not to be expected, however, that so great a breach with the traditions of *laissez-faire* should be allowed to pass without challenge by part at least of the Liberal Party. The policy was attacked by Mr. Runciman, who argued that the Bill was not for the period of the war, but was a measure leading to the foundation of a permanent policy, and as such it was a breach of the agreement not to introduce contentious measures during the war. The Bill could be no substitute for a more effective action against submarines by the Admiralty, and he insisted that the national security would be better achieved by the storing of sufficient wheat to live on. A later speaker, Mr. Lough, objected to the Bill on the ground that it introduced a most obnoxious system of protection. A tariff would put something into the coffers of the State, but, on the contrary, this Bill involved the expenditure of a huge sum. On the second evening of the debate, there was again a good deal of Liberal opposition to the policy of guaranteed prices, but when the vote was taken, the second reading was passed by 288 votes to 27, a result which hardly reflected the strength of the "anti-bounty" sentiment expressed in the course of the debate.

Among other topics which received attention during the latter part of April was the report of the Royal Commission on the profits from huts erected for the Army. Allegations had

been made that Sir John Jackson, Ltd., had, on the outbreak of the war, offered to erect huts for no payment but the bare cost, and that later on, when it was impossible to alter the arrangements, the firm had claimed a commission of 5 per cent. on all future work. The Royal Commissioners gave a somewhat non-committal report. Among other findings were "that Sir John Jackson and his Company should be relieved from the imputations of having intentionally brought about a state of things in which they could extort exorbitant terms"—but "that the amount to which Sir John Jackson, Ltd., became entitled under the agreement in the events which happened was greatly excessive." Sir John Jackson immediately wrote to the Financial Secretary to the War Office, offering to reduce the 5 per cent to 4 per cent.

Great excitement was caused in certain circles by the prohibition, in the middle of April, of the export of copies of *The Nation*, and on April 18 Mr Pringle moved the adjournment of the House of Commons to call attention to the matter. He declared that the action had been taken, not for the alleged reason that *The Nation* was publishing articles which were pessimistic and likely to discourage the country, but because the editor, one of the most fearless and courageous men in British journalism, would not take his marching orders either from the Press Bureau or No. 10 Downing Street. The matter was so important that the Prime Minister himself intervened, declaring that he had known nothing about the matter until he had read of it in *The Times*, and that the action taken against *The Nation* was not on account of any attack upon him, but was done in the ordinary course of action of a Government department, following the precedent set by the late Government. For some time articles had appeared in *The Nation* pressing for peace on the ground that military victory was impossible, and the war practically a deadlock. He declined to believe that this was the view of sober Liberalism. The Government were entitled to protect our soldiers by forbidding the export of material which constituted the greatest encouragement which the enemy could possibly get. In the subsequent course of the debate, Mr Churchill, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr Bonar Law) all spoke, but the matter was not pressed to a vote, and at eleven o'clock the debate was adjourned. The matter was raised again in the House of Lords on April 24, when Lord Russell asked what were the grounds on which *The Nation* had been prohibited from being sent abroad, whether the Prime Minister was cognisant of the order, and if not, whether he would take steps to have it rescinded. Lord Derby replying, said that he took the fullest responsibility for the action which had been taken, and that the export of the journal had not been prohibited until actual use had been made of its articles by the enemy, and that any other newspaper pur-

suing the same course as *The Nation* would be stopped in the same way

Towards the end of April, on the 26th, there was an interesting debate in the House of Commons on the Air Service, when Mr Baird, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Air Board, submitted a detailed account of the work of his department, showing that the output for January and February of this year was double the monthly average output for the previous year, and it was anticipated that by the end of the current year this figure would again be doubled. Mr Baird went on to say that it was the opinion of the Board that the Government should immediately take in hand the investigation of the possibilities of civil aerial transport after the war, and he announced that Lord Northcliffe had accepted the chairmanship of a committee, charged to consider and report on the steps which should be taken, with a view to the development of aviation for civil and commercial purposes, from a domestic, imperial and international standpoint. With regard to the position at the front, Mr Baird was prepared to admit that his department, if asked whether they were entirely satisfied with the machines used, would reply, "No, we are not," but he gave assurances that the authorities were endeavouring as fast as was possible to effect improvements

The last Friday of the month saw an important statement of economic policy made in the House of Commons by Mr. Bonar Law, and by Mr. Lloyd George at the Guildhall, on the occasion of his receiving the Freedom of the City of London. Mr. Bonar Law announced that the Imperial War Cabinet had accepted the principle of Imperial preference for the Empire. He said that it was hoped that each part of the Empire, having due regard to the interests of our Allies, would give specially favourable treatment and facilities to the produce and manufactures of other parts of the Empire. In reply to questions, he added that at present Australia was not included (it will be remembered Australia was not represented at the Imperial Conference), that there was no intention of making any change during the war, and that the resolution did not involve the taxation of food. Mr Lloyd George, in his speech at the Guildhall, after dealing with the military situation, which he declared was turning increasingly to the advantage of this country, and with the food problem, which he proposed to deal with by the avoidance of waste and the increase of cultivation, went on to discuss the reorganisation of the Empire, which the war had made inevitable. He said that the war had shown that the British Empire was the most potent factor in the struggle for human liberty, and that the Dominions by their efforts had established claims to a real partnership. Henceforth, effective consultation must be the only basis of co-operation. "Our Councils of Empire must be a reality. The Imperial War Cabinet, the first ever held, has been a demon-

stration of the value of this Council. We have had war decisions of the most far-reaching character in which our colleagues from beyond the seas have assisted us. These great problems in regard to submarines, shipping, and food, as well as our military decisions, have all come for review at councils in which they have taken part." He went on to say that one of the first duties of statesmanship in the future would be to take all measures which were necessary for the development of the stupendous resources of the Empire, and that they had decided that it was the business of statesmanship to knit the Empire in closer bonds of interest, of trade, of commerce, of business, and of general intercourse in affairs. Therefore, they had decided that it was necessary that in future exceptional encouragement should be given to the products of each part of the Empire, and that they believed that a system of preference could be established which would not involve the impositions of any burden on food. He ended his speech by calling attention to two problems in the organisation of the Empire. The one was Ireland, "to have a well-knit and a powerful Empire we must convert Ireland from a suspicious, surly, dangerous neighbour to a cheerful, loyal comrade. If I appeal for the settlement of Ireland, it is because I know from facts which are driven into my mind every hour from America, Australia, and from every part that it is one of the essentials of speedy victory." The other question was India. India had given enthusiastic and loyal help to the Empire, and therefore her loyal myriads ought to be treated not as a subject race in the Empire but as partner nations.

On the same day in the House of Commons, Mr Kellaway, speaking for the Ministry of Munitions at the second reading of the Munitions of War Bill, declared that the chief object of the Bill was to enable the Government to secure the dilution of skilled labour in private work. Before the war the proportion of women to men in the employment of firms which had since become controlled was 7 : 1. Last December it had increased to 21 : 2. In the engineering industry the proportions were 2 : 8 before the war and 21 : 5 last December. In varying degrees similar increases had taken place in electrical engineering, and in the manufacture of small arms, of scientific instruments, of explosives, and of woodwork. He went on to deal with the increase in the expenditure of shell in the new British offensive. The expenditure of shell 6 in. and upwards in the first week of the recent offensive was nearly twice that of the first week in the Somme Battle. During the second week the expenditure was six and a half times that of the second week of the Somme Battle. These results, it was argued, had justified the dilution of labour and the case for extending it, so that the need for skilled men was greater than the supply for workshops which were called upon to deal with an ever-increasing amount of gun repairs, and also for shops turning

out tanks, aeroplanes, and big guns. The rejection of the Bill was moved, but only 10 votes were cast against the Government at the finish.

During the month of May the submarine situation continued to be very serious. Sir Edward Carson had stated on the last day of April in the House of Commons that the shipping losses were increasing, and the gravity of his demeanour on this occasion had greatly impressed the House, so that in the Lobby, as elsewhere, the submarine menace was almost the sole topic of conversation. Lord Curzon, in a speech to the Primrose League on May 3, somewhat reassured the public mind. He declared that the Germans pinned their whole faith to the prosecution of the submarine campaign. They believed that within a few weeks they would succeed in starving this country and our Allies into surrender. Lord Curzon thought it possible that compulsory rationing would come, but he did not think there was the slightest cause for panic or real alarm, and he did not think that the menace of the submarines would effect the ultimate issues of the war. Towards the middle of the month, the situation began to show a slight improvement. In the first week in May only twenty-four vessels of 1,600 tons or over were sunk, as compared with thirty-eight and forty in the two last weeks of April. The seriousness of the situation had, however, led to a reorganisation of the Admiralty, the purpose of which was to strengthen the Navy war staff as well as to put the supply department of the Navy upon a stronger and more assured business footing. The First Sea Lord and his colleagues, the Second and Fourth Sea Lords, were relieved of the greater part of the departmental work connected with the provision of material and the administration of the supply department of the Navy, and the two latter were to act as a consultative board to the First Lord, and to devote practically their whole attention to the strategic problems and plans of the sea warfare. Consequent upon these changes, the office of Admiralty Controller was revived, and the official holding this post was charged with the organisation and administration of the supply department of the Navy, including transport, victualling, the manufacture of ordnance, and shipbuilding. For the second week of May the submarine losses showed a still further decline, being only eighteen for ships over 1,600 tons or over and only five for the smaller vessels, although the arrivals and sailings for the week showed an increase. The third week remained about the same level, eighteen ships of 1,600 tons and over, nine under 1,600 tons—these for a slightly larger number of arrivals and sailings. For the week ending May 27 the numbers for the large ships were about the same, but the number of smaller ships sunk was as low as two. For the time being the alarm excited by the heavy losses of April began to disappear. The Prime Minister had already on May 26 indicated that the Government had every hope of overcoming the submarine

danger. The arrangements, he explained, for dealing with submarines were increasingly efficient, and the country owed a great debt of gratitude to the American people for their effective assistance. He declared at the same time that there was a distinct improvement in the food situation, and he asserted that the submarine menace could not cause the loss of the war, provided that the following conditions were observed (1) If the nation is not guilty of waste (2) If those who have got land available for the production of food make the best use of it. (3) If workmen turn out tractors in order to help with the ploughing. (4) If the Army help with all the available men for the purpose of cultivating land.

At the beginning of May, when the submarine menace was still very alarming, the question of compulsory rationing was much before the public. Lord Curzon said on the 31st of the month that he thought that in all probability compulsory rationing would come, and that he himself believed that it ought to come. On the same day Captain Bathurst made an indecisive statement on the subject in the House of Commons. The Food Controller issued a statement that the necessary machinery could not possibly be ready before the middle of July, and that it even then might not be necessary if the public loyally observed the exhortation to reduce the consumption of bread by one-fourth. The dilution of flour was continued, and, for instance early in May, instructions were given that no more barley was to be milled except to produce regulation flour. On the 8th of the month there was a full-dress debate in the House of Lords. The debate was opened by Lord Buckmaster, who inquired whether the Government proposed to take any immediate steps to secure equitable distribution of food supplies among all classes. He urged that the public should be told the exact and literal truth about the action of the submarines, and demanded that any scheme of rationing should fall equally on all. Lord Beresford, who followed, spoke with great gravity of the shipping position, which, in his view, would become more dangerous as the summer went on. Lord Devonport in his answer refused to make any definite pronouncement on the issue between voluntary and compulsory rationing. He declared that a diminution in the consumption of bread-stuffs was of vital importance, but that if the call for reduction was attended to, and if the efforts of submarines were not successful beyond reasonable likelihood, we would get through to the harvest with a fairly satisfactory margin in hand. Lord Devonport then announced the withdrawal of the meatless days, and that the Government control of cereals had been very much extended. The Government was now in control of all imports. A debate on a considerable scale followed, in which Lord Lansdowne and Lord Salisbury suggested that the position was by no means too satisfactory. Finally, Lord Milner rose to speak for the War Cabinet. He explained that the Government would only resort to compulsion if they

were convinced of the absolute necessity for it. In the meantime, pains were being taken to study various methods of rationing, so that if the Government were obliged to adopt compulsion, they might be able to adopt the best method that could be devised. He assured the House that the Government would not hesitate to make any call on the people which circumstances justified, and he was satisfied that we could last out the struggle. On the same day in the House of Commons, Captain Bathurst announced that sales of bread showed an average decrease of 4 per cent as compared with March, but he warned the House that the consumption of bread was always materially lower in the summer than in the winter. On the following day, May 9, Captain Bathurst made a new demand for sacrifice in regard to the use of starch. He was asked to state definitely whether it was unpatriotic to wear starched linen, and he declared that even Beau Brummel would in existing circumstances have accepted the situation with resignation. The prohibition of the manufacture of starch, except under licence, would, in due course, prevent the wearing of starched garments. The need for the saving of wheat continued to be urged by the authorities, who entrusted to the National War Savings Committee and its 1200 Local Committees the duty of teaching people why and how they must reduce their consumption of bread and other staple food-stuffs. They were issuing cards by which housewives were asked to bind themselves not to use more than the voluntary rations. They were organising lectures, meetings, and cookery demonstrations, and were establishing a certain number of communal kitchens. A strong manifesto on the subject was drawn up by the War Emergency Workers' National Committee, and was submitted to the various sections of the Labour Co-operative and Industrial Women's Movement. In the manifesto the Workers' National Committee stated that they had, since the beginning of the war, put forward suggestions in the direction of organisation by the State to secure not only an ample production of food-stuffs, but also their equitable distribution. These representations, they declared, had been repudiated as unnecessary or revolutionary, but the development of the submarine campaign had accentuated the problem, and given emphasis to the past proposals of the Committee. They set forth a draft policy as follows. (a) The purchase of all essential imported food-stuffs. (b) The commandeering or controlling of all home-grown food products, such as wheat, meat, oats, potatoes, and milk. (c) The commandeering of ships and the control of transport facilities. (d) The placing on the retail markets of all supplies so obtained and controlled at prices which will secure the benefit of Government action to the consumer, and the proportional regulation on a family basis of the sale of any food-stuffs in which there is a shortage of supplies. (e) The fixing of the price of bread at sixpence per quarter loaf, any loss involved to be met as a portion of the general

cost of the war. The Committee suggested that Local Authorities should be given power to set up special Food Control Committees for the purpose of supervising local distribution of food-stuffs. On May 11 the Food Controller issued an Order imposing restrictions on the feeding of horses, and provided a scale of rations for horses doing different kinds of work. By the middle of the month the situation began to brighten. The Ministry of Food on May 14 stated that the necessity of compulsory rationing was steadily receding, but a few days later the question of the supplies of sugar became again more difficult, and Captain Bathurst declared in the House of Commons that the dearth was abnormal, and that it was very difficult for the Sugar Commission to supply all the wholesalers with their usual quota. Again in the House of Lords, on the 17th, an attempt was made to get the Food Controller to agree to the introduction of compulsory rationing. Lord Devonport, however, made an optimistic reply, stating that the voluntary campaign was becoming effective in bringing about a decrease in the consumption of food-stuffs, and in particular bread. Still, he repeated his former warning that if the voluntary effort were not successfully continued, compulsion would be inevitable, and added the important information that the Local Authorities would shortly be called on to take their part in the system of food distribution and control. On the same day the Miners' Federation of Great Britain held a special conference to discuss the question of compulsory rationing, and passed resolutions instructing its executive committee to approach the Government for information as to whether there was any necessity for the adoption of compulsory rationing, and also that they should endeavour to meet the Prime Minister and point out to him the absolute necessity for the entire control of the food supply being taken over by the Government in order to put a stop to the shameful profiteering which (it was alleged) was taking place in the country. The increasing scarcity of sugar (it was noted in *The Times* on May 18 that sugar queues were beginning to appear at London shops) led to a further drastic reduction of the use of sugar for sweets and confectionery. The manufacturers had already in March been cut down to 40 per cent of the amount used in 1915, and by the new Order the quantity was to be still further reduced to 25 per cent. The growth of scarcities in these commodities soon began to be reflected in the increasing prices of other articles. Meat towards the end of the month became scarce and dear, and as much as two shillings a pound was being asked for the best joints of beef and mutton. This led to a demand for the fixing of prices for essential food-stuffs. Mr. Kennedy Jones pointed out in a speech in Edinburgh on May 19 that it was no good trying to fix prices unless supplies could be controlled, and that in particular the control of prices was extremely difficult in cases where the bulk of the product came from merchants overseas, where it was not possible to compel the merchant to

sell at the prices fixed in Great Britain. At the same time he admitted that there were legitimate causes of complaint in regard to profiteering as between traders and merchants and retailers in this country, and he stated that the question of legislation making it a criminal offence to gamble in the food of the people was receiving the anxious consideration of the Food Controller, and he hoped that meat, for instance, would not long remain at its present high and unreasonable price. The Ministry of Food began to make careful inquiries, as had been foreshadowed in Mr Kennedy Jones's speech, and Lord Devonport was soon in consultation with representatives of the wholesale and retail meat trades, and on the 24th Captain Bathurst stated that the retail price of meat would shortly be brought under control by means of a schedule worked out by experts. Meanwhile, scarcity and dearness was threatened in another quarter. The Advisory Committee on Milk recommended that the price of milk should be regulated, so that the retailer should be entitled to charge a maximum price of sevenpence per quart up to September 30. They also recommended that the attention of the Board of Agriculture should be called to suggestions for increasing the supply of milk. (1) That no more experienced milkmen should be called into the Army (2) That all heifers and young cows of the best dairy type should be preserved for breeding purposes, and that dairy cows should be given the preference in the distribution of concentrated food. Orders were issued on May 30 regulating the imports and prices of tobacco and of tea.

At the very end of the month a storm of protest on the subject of the high prices burst out. The working classes were convinced that there was a certain amount of evidence to justify their view, that the high prices were not due fundamentally to scarcity but to manipulation of the market by speculators. The National Union of Corporation Workers, for example, at their Whitsuntide Conference, passed a resolution condemning Lord Devonport for allowing the public to be "systematically robbed by profiteers owing to his inaction," and demanded his resignation. On May 30 it was announced that Lord Devonport's health was far from satisfactory, and that he had made it clear that he could not continue much longer in his arduous and highly important office, and the Government was reported to be considering the question of his successor. Among various suggestions made were that a representative of labour should take on the position, or that Dr Addison should be transferred from the Ministry of Munitions. The economy campaign continued during May. In the discussion of the Budget, *v. p.* 134, Mr. Bonar Law announced proposals for the taxing of dogs, by which it was proposed to make a very slight increase in the case of people who now have a licence for one dog, but to increase the tax very considerably for the second dog, or in the case of people who proposed to start keeping dogs not having

had any previously. In the course of the discussion, several members expressed the view that it was unfortunate that no attempt had been made to tax the large amounts of money now possessed by private individuals and often wasted. One speaker, Mr Arnold, contended that additional taxation to the amount of 30,000,000*l.* ought to have been imposed, and demanded the taxation of titles and mining royalties. Mr Bonar Law in replying expressed surprise at the idea that enough was not being got out of rich people. The one thing that had impressed him more than another in connexion with the war—except perhaps the readiness of men of all ranks to risk their lives—was the readiness with which people had borne taxation of a weight never known before.

The Members of the Imperial War Conference were received by the King at Windsor on May 3, when they presented a loyal address to which the King made a reply, in the course of which he said that the Conference had met at an historic moment in the Empire's story, and that he was confident that when peace was restored, "We may be found prepared for the tasks which then await us in the organisation of the resources of the Empire with a view to rendering it more self-sustaining and in strengthening the ties which knit together all parts of my Dominions." The speech referred also to the satisfaction felt by His Majesty in the fact that India had been a member of the Conference with equal rights with the other Dominions. On the same day the Secretary of State for the Colonies issued a statement in which he said that it was not possible, owing to the confidential character of the business, to publish in full the resolutions or the debates on the subjects before the Conference, but he was ready to give such of the resolutions as could now be made public. In every case the decision of the Conference had been unanimous. The most important of the resolutions was that dealing with the future constitutional relations of the Empire. This, it was stated, was too important a subject to be dealt with during the war, and they had therefore recommended that a special Imperial Conference to deal with the question should be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities. The Conference, however, placed on record "its view that any such re-adjustment while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of existing affairs should be based on the full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth, and of India as an important portion of the same, should recognise the rights of the Dominions and India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations, and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action founded on consultation as the several Governments may determine." The importance of this resolution is that while de-

manding that the Dominions should share in the foreign policy of the Empire, they still asserted their right to complete national autonomy, and thus by implication stated their objections to any scheme of Imperial federation, which would involve the setting up of an Imperial Legislature or Imperial Executive with power to legislate for the whole Empire, and to over-ride the subordinate Parliaments. The meeting of the Conference marked an important step in Imperial development, for its discussions included also the question of Imperial Preference, and other matters of importance.

An interesting sequel to the meetings of the Imperial Conference took place on May 17, when the Prime Minister announced in the House of Commons that the experiment of an Imperial War Cabinet had been a complete success. Accordingly, at the last session, the Prime Minister had formally proposed on behalf of the British Government that meetings of an Imperial Cabinet consisting of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, such of his colleagues as dealt specially with Imperial affairs, the Prime Minister of each of the Dominions, and a representative of the Indian people to be appointed by the Government of India, should be held annually or at any intermediate time when matters of urgent Imperial concern had to be settled. These proposals met with cordial approval from the oversea representatives, and the announcement of the decision was received with great satisfaction in the House of Commons.

Another Imperial problem, for the settlement of which a new plan was proposed during May, was the old standing sore of the Government of Ireland. The Prime Minister sent to the Leader of the Irish Party and the Leader of the Ulster Unionists on May 16 a letter proposing the introduction of a Bill for the immediate application of the Home Rule Act to Ireland, with the exclusion for a period of five years for the counties of north-east Ulster. The Government suggested also the establishment of a Council of Ireland consisting of two delegations; on the one hand of all the members returned to Westminster from the excluded area, and on the other of a delegation equal in number from the Irish Parliament. It was to be the business of this council to take steps to maintain the unity of Irish legislation, and it would be consulted if the question was raised of extending the Home Rule Act to the whole of Ireland, subject to the assent of the majority of the voters in the excluded area. The Government also proposed some re-adjustment of the financial proposals of the Home Rule Act, and they suggested that after the second reading this Bill, together with the Home Rule Act, should be considered by a Conference on the lines of the Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform meeting under an impartial chairman commanding a general confidence. At the end of his letter, Mr. Lloyd George suggested that if these proposals were not satisfactory, steps should be taken to assemble a Convention of Irishmen of both parties, for the purpose of

producing a scheme of Irish self-government, and he drew attention to the remarkable success which had attended the work of the South African Convention, despite most formidable difficulties. On the following day the Nationalist and Irish Unionist parties met to consider the question, and immediately sent replies to Mr Lloyd George. Mr Redmond stated that the first proposal would find no support in Ireland, but he agreed on behalf of his party to the second alternative, *i.e.*, the holding of an Irish Convention. Sir John Lonsdale, on behalf of his party, stated that he would be prepared to lay the proposals in the letter before the Ulster Unionist Council. The opinion of the Nationalists in Ireland was stated to be unanimously hostile to the proposed scheme of partition. Ulster, on the other hand, was prepared to give the Council of Ireland a trial, though it was suggested that the five years' limit to definite exclusion might prove an insurmountable object. A few days later, Lord Midleton, on behalf of Unionists in the South and West of Ireland, stated that while he and his friends could give no support to the proposal of partition, they were prepared to submit the plan for a Convention to the Irish Unionist Alliance if the Convention were fully representative of Irish interests, and if its proceedings were subject to the review of the Imperial Parliament. A debate on the subject took place in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons on May 21, when it was announced that the Government had decided to summon immediately a Convention of representative Irishmen in Ireland to submit to the British Government and Parliament a constitution for the future government of Ireland within the Empire. Mr. Lloyd George wasted no words on the specific scheme submitted to the Irish Leaders, which had been decisively refused by the Nationalists, and by no means welcomed by the Unionists, but devoted the greater part of his speech to the alternative proposal of the Convention. He submitted that the time had come for Ireland to try her own hand at hammering out an instrument of self-government for her own people. Had not experiments of the same kind succeeded in Canada, Australia, and South Africa? He told the House frankly that in the judgment of the Government a settlement would materially help in the successful conclusion of the war, and he stated that the Government were prepared, if the Conference should reach substantial agreement, to accept the responsibility for giving legislative effect to the questions of the Convention. It was proposed that it should not be a Convention merely of political authorities, though they should all be represented, including the Sinn Feiners. It should include also representatives of the local governing bodies, the Churches, the trade unions, and the commercial and educational interests of Ireland. He proposed that the chairman should be nominated by the Crown, that the Government letter should form the terms of reference, and that the Convention should be held with closed doors. The proposals were most favourably received

by the House. Mr Redmond declared that for the first time in her history, Ireland had been asked to settle these problems for herself. Mr. Asquith intervened to assure the Government of the sympathy of his party and to support the appeal to Nationalists and Ulstermen to accept the proposal. Sir Edward Carson stated that in his opinion the proposals of the Government marked an important advance towards an ultimate reunion for the whole of Ireland. He agreed with Sir John Lonsdale, who had previously put the case for Ulster. The Government plan would be laid before the Ulster Unionist Council, and although neither Sir John Lonsdale nor Sir Edward Carson were prepared to assert that the Council would agree to the Convention, yet Sir Edward Carson stated at the end of his speech that there was no man in the House who would like to see the question settled more than himself. In the House of Lords there was a debate equally fine in tone and temper. Lord Curzon announced the Government's plan, and particularly emphasised the importance of an Irish settlement in securing full co-operation with the United States. All the speakers in the debate, in which Lord Midleton, Lord Londonderry, and Lord Bryce took part, expressed satisfaction with the Government's plan, and hoped that it might be a success, though Lord Midleton expressed the view that no plan could be a success which would over-ride the interests of the Protestants of the South of Ireland, who would find it very difficult to express any voice in the Government as opposed to the immensely larger power of the Nationalists. Mr. Lloyd George's speech had immediate effect in Ireland, and it was very shortly known that both the northern and southern Unionists would consent to take part in the Convention. The Ulster Unionist Council called a Conference which met at Belfast on June 8, and decided to accede to the Government's invitation to send representatives, on the understanding that no scheme would be forced on the Ulster Unionists with which their representatives were not in agreement. The way was now cleared for the assembly of the Convention, and on June 11 the Prime Minister announced in the House of Commons that invitations were about to be issued for a Convention of 101 members. Each County Council and County Borough was to be asked to send its Chairman, and the Chairmen of the small towns or urban districts were to be invited to select two members for each of the four provinces. Four Roman Catholic Bishops, together with the Primate and Archbishop of Dublin, representing the Protestant Church of Ireland, and also the Moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Assembly were expected to attend. The Chairmen of the Dublin, Belfast, and Cork Chambers of Commerce were to be invited as spokesmen of commerce, together with five representatives of labour from the Trade Councils of Dublin and Cork and the Trade Unions of Belfast. Five members were to be assigned to the Nationalists, the Ulster Unionists and the Southern Unionists.

respectively, two members to the O'Brienites, and also to the Irish peers. The spokesmen of Sinn Fein had declared against entering the Convention, but the Government would, nevertheless, reserve for them five places. Finally, the Government would nominate the chairman as well as fifteen leading Irishmen of all sections.

There was considerable difficulty in finding a chairman for the Convention. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Duke were both suggested, and it had even at one time been thought possible that the Speaker of the House of Commons might be able to act. None of these proved possible, and the question had, therefore, for a time, to be postponed. Meanwhile, the Government announced that it had decided to release without reservation all the prisoners in confinement in connexion with the rebellion of Easter, 1916, in order that the Convention should be able to meet in an atmosphere of harmony and goodwill. The released prisoners arrived in Ireland on June 18, and had a tremendous reception. They left the boat at Kingstown in a procession which was led by Mr. de Valera, at that time Sinn Fein candidate for East Clare, and they were welcomed by Dublin with frantic enthusiasm. The Sinn Feiners, however, were not mollified by this act of clemency, and when the prisoners arrived at Cork, a violent riot took place, the windows of the county gaol being smashed and the Sinn Fein drill hall which had been closed by the Military Authorities seized and the republican flag planted on the roof. Minor troubles were reported from various parts of the country, and hopes of the Sinn Feiners taking part in the Convention steadily diminished. Meanwhile, many of the proposed non-political representatives intimated their acceptance of the Government's invitation, including the Lord Mayor of Dublin, the Mayor of Limerick, and the representatives of the Province of Leinster. Mr. William O'Brien, on the other hand, refused on the ground that the majority of the members would be virtually nominees of the two Irish parties who had previously come to an agreement on partition. He declared that nine-tenths of the Convention were "pawned beforehand to partitionist compromise." The attitude of the Sinn Feiners also became more and more hostile. Mr. de Valera, the candidate for East Clare, asserted that the extremists would accept nothing less than complete independence for Ireland. Meanwhile, the Government went on with its plans, and on July 6 the Prime Minister intimated to the House of Commons that the Convention would assemble on July 25, with Mr. Duke as temporary chairman. A cloud was cast over the prospects of the Convention by the victory of Mr. de Valera in the East Clare election by a majority of very nearly 30,000. This indicated that the Sinn Fein movement had replaced the Nationalist Party among the younger and more excitable voters in Ireland. Irish opinion was, for a time, frankly pessimistic about the prospects of the Convention. The

list of Government nominees included Sir Horace Plunkett, who, from the very beginning, took a cheerful view of the possibilities of the Convention, Mr. Mahaffy, the Provost of Trinity College, and also A. E. (Mr. George Russell), known alike as a practical co-operator and as a poet of some distinction. The Convention finally met on July 25 at Regent House, which had been offered for the purpose by Trinity College. A regulation under the Defence of the Realm Act had been issued, making it unlawful for anyone to violate the secrecy of the Convention. It attracted curiously little attention from the crowds in Dublin. A number of persons gathered in the College Green to watch the delegates assemble, but there was no excitement and hardly any cheering. The first meeting under Mr. Duke's chairmanship unanimously recommended the appointment of Sir Horace Plunkett as chairman and Sir Francis Hopwood as secretary. Immediately thereafter the Convention set to work to appoint a Preliminary Procedure Committee to lay down the methods by which the Convention should carry on its business. It was generally felt that Sir Horace Plunkett's appointment to the chairmanship was a good omen for the fortune of the Convention, as it had been expected by many that the very first rock on which the Convention would split would be the finding of a chairman acceptable to all parties.

We may now turn to that other question of constitutional adjustment which was attractive of importance at this time—the representation of the people. The Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on May 15. Its chief provisions were that the principal qualification for men of 21 and over was to be six months' residence or occupation of business premises. All existing franchises were to be swept away, except the University franchise, which was to be extended to graduates of the younger Universities. The franchise was to be conferred on any woman on the Local Government register, and on the wife of any man who is on that register if she has attained the age of 30 years. Other provisions were a half-yearly revision of the register, redistribution of seats in Great Britain on the basis of 70,000 as the standard unit of population for each member, all elections to be held on one day, returning officers' charges to be paid by the State, soldiers and sailors to be qualified to vote in the area in which they usually reside, and proportional representation in large urban areas. Mr. Long, in introducing the Bill, presented it not as an ordinary Government measure, but as the project of all parties. The attitude of the Government was that they would do their best to secure the adoption of the greater part of the proposals, but Woman Suffrage and proportional representation were to be left to be decided by a free and unfettered House. The Government had already set up a Boundary Commission to deal with redistribution. In the subsequent debate some opposition was

expressed against the Bill, but it was not persisted in. The first reading was passed without a division. The second reading came on on May 22, when Sir George Cave declared that the Bill would add to the 8,000,000 existing electors about 2,000,000 new men voters, and 6,000,000 women, of whom 5,000,000 would be married. He asked whether it was possible to refuse the women a voice in moulding the future of the country, which their devoted self-sacrifice had done so much to save. The debate, as a whole, went strongly in favour of the Bill, though some opposition was expressed by Lord Hugh Cecil, and the second reading was carried on the following day by 329 votes to 40. The Bill entered on its committee stage on June 6, when a small and hostile section moved amendments which were very easily disposed of. The first was a proposal to restrict the franchise to men of 25 years and upwards, and the second a fruitless attempt by Sir Frederick Banbury to preserve the ownership vote. A good deal of opposition was aroused by the redistribution proposals, and on June 11 several members for agricultural constituencies successfully pressed the Government to make some relaxation by instructing the Boundary Commissioners to regard area as well as population in forming the redistribution schedule. At a very early stage the House of Commons took up a hostile attitude on proportional representation. It was the first of the two issues of the Reform Bill on which the House of Commons was left free by the Government, and it was decided on June 12 that the Boundary Commissioners should act on the assumption that proportional representation was not adopted. The second debatable point, namely Woman Suffrage, was discussed in committee on June 19, when the House of Commons accepted the principle by the overwhelming majority of 385 members against a minority of 55. The tone of the discussion was curiously different from the flippancy with which the question had been treated in previous years. The debate began by the Chairman of Committees ruling out of order Mr Arnold Ward's amendment to make the adoption of Woman Suffrage dependent on a referendum. Sir Frederick Banbury then presented the argument against the women having the vote, namely, that the House had no mandate, and that women had not suffered by not having the vote. Sir Charles Hothouse, in seconding the amendment, declared that the capacity of women was best utilised when it was directed to domestic and local activities only. Lord Hugh Cecil turned the tables on the members who in previous years had treated Woman Suffrage as a joke, by showing that the anti-suffragist's view was equally humorous. He amused the House by a synopsis of an hypothetical romance entitled, "How Mother Voted, or The Ruined Home," in which the argument was supposed to be that the wear and tear of the franchise would drive the woman into an inebriate's home, where she would only be able to give an absent vote. Several Ministers

took part in the debate, and most of them declared that the experiences of the war had shown that the conscious co-operation of women in the activities of the nation was a source of strength and not of weakness. Sir John Simon insisted also that the industrial problem would be more than before a women's problem, and the solution could not, in any justice, be attempted by a Parliament with an exclusive male electorate. At the end of the sitting Sir Frederick Banbury's amendment was heavily defeated.

On the following day, June 20, the House of Commons considered the qualifications which must be possessed by women parliamentary electors. The only substantial point which remained to be decided was the age-limit. This the Bill had fixed at 30 years, and many of the anti-suffragists tried to produce dissension among the suffragists and an ultimate reduction of the principle by proposals to remove or lower the age-limit. Sir George Cave, who was in charge of the Bill, opposed this alteration, and declared roundly that if any such amendment were accepted, he could not be responsible for the further conduct of the Bill. The amendment was rejected by an overwhelming vote, and in the end the clause enfranchising women was added to the Bill by a vote of 214 members as against 17. The House then proceeded to discuss a series of Government amendments securing the franchise to soldiers and sailors. Every soldier and sailor on active service and on full pay was to have the right to vote for the place of his home. The debate was resumed on the 25th, when it was proposed that the voting age for soldiers and sailors who had seen active service should be 19 years, and it was argued that if a soldier was old enough to fight, he was old enough to vote. The feeling expressed in the House was so strong that the Government promised to reconsider the matter. On the following day two proposals of interest were made. (1) That the pauper disqualification should be removed, which the Government accepted; and (2) a proposal disfranchising conscientious objectors. Mr M'Neill, who moved this amendment, declared that the conscientious objectors had been able to shelter themselves from the perils and sacrifices which had been accepted by other people, and after the war they would enjoy the immunities and liberties which had been preserved to them by the efforts of others. Were they then to be allowed to exercise the franchise when the present peril was over? Lord Hugh Cecil made an eloquent speech, pleading for liberty of conscience, and declaring that since conscientious objectors perversely but sincerely adhered to the higher law which was above the safety of the republic, it belonged to the credit of their country to respect their convictions, and he earnestly hoped for the honour and credit of the House and for the sake of the nation of which they were citizens, that the amendment would be rejected. Sir John Simon also spoke against the proposal, and Sir

George Cave, while stating that he himself would be in favour of such an amendment, took the line that since the Government had passed an Act allowing these men to obtain exemption, they could not now impose on them a penalty when they availed themselves of that permission. The amendment was negatived.

On July 4 the question of proportional representation came before the House. The proposal was supported by Mr Asquith, who explained that of late years he had been increasingly impressed with the illogical application of the representative principle by the adoption of majority rule, and he held that with the addition of 8,000,000 new electors the tendency to the domination of majorities and the suppression of minorities would increase. Lord Robert Cecil also supported proportional representation, declaring that in the existing electoral system the House of Commons did not represent the opinion of the country, and what was more serious, did not hold the same position in the country as formerly. This he attributed to the exaggeration of the party system, which he thought would be diminished by proportional representation. Mr. Austin Chamberlain took the opposite point of view. He argued that a strong party majority was needed to make Government effective, and that were the system weakened, the more would the House of Commons become a place of bargaining between groups instead of fulfilling its mission as the grand inquest of the nation. The proposal was also supported by Sir John Simon and Sir F. E. Smith, but when the vote was taken "Proportional Representation" was rejected by 201 votes to 169. Satisfactory progress had thus been made with the Bill before the adjournment, and when it was announced in the middle of July that further stages would be postponed till the autumn, there was no fear that the postponement meant any intention to drop the Bill.

Meanwhile, the Boundary Commissioners had been proceeding with their schemes of redistribution. At the beginning of July they had formed schemes for twenty-five English counties, dividing the counties into single member divisions, varying in number from one to nine. At the end of the month they issued their report for the redistribution of seats in London. They proposed to allocate to the London boroughs, apart from the City, fifty-nine members—an addition of two. These schemes made many changes in the London electoral map. Certain long-established parliamentary divisions, such as Hanover Square, Strand, and Tower Hamlets had disappeared, and many new divisions, such as Abbey, Hyde Park and Arsenal, came into existence. Proposals were issued at the same time for other parts of England. Birmingham gained five seats, Sheffield and West Ham two each, while Devonport and Plymouth, on the contrary, were merged into one. Before the adjournment, one or two other interesting points were decided. On August 9, the House voted in favour of the alternative vote defined as meaning "A vote given so as to indicate the

voter's preference for the candidates in order and capable of being transferred to a subsequent choice in case any one candidate has a clear majority of the total number of votes given." The Government Whips were not put on, and the clause was finally carried by a single vote. On the same day it was decided that in university constituencies returning two or more members, proportional representation should be applied. On the same day also the clause for holding all polls at a general election on the same day was agreed to. Shortly before the adjournment the scheme for enabling soldiers and sailors serving abroad to vote by proxy was considered. The Home Secretary, Sir George Cave, explained that the naval or military voter would apply for a proxy form to the registration officer. He could then nominate whom he pleased, and would send the paper with such instructions as he thought fit to his proxy who must be either an elector of the constituency or the wife or other near relation of the voter. It was proposed in order to avoid political agents acting as proxies, that no one should be entitled to be proxy for more than one voter. The Home Secretary explained that in producing this plan he had done his best to find an effective way by which the soldier's vote should be a reality and not a sham. Mr. Herbert Samuel urged objections against the scheme. He agreed that they wanted as many soldiers to vote as possible, but they wanted the soldiers themselves to vote. In the end the question was postponed.

We have been discussing various questions which attracted attention during the summer, and for the sake of completeness have treated them as a whole. We must now turn back to some important events of May and June. It was towards the middle of May that the main lines were settled on which the new Naval War Staff was constituted. Sir John Jellicoe, as Chief of the Staff, was freed of all administrative detail in order that he might give his undivided attention to questions of policy and strategy. He had the assistance of a director of operations whose business it was to work out the plans in detail, a director of intelligence, and the directors of several Admiralty Departments, including those charged with new construction, with transport, and with measures for curtailing the submarine menace. It was decided to call in organising capacity which had made its mark outside the Service, and Sir Eric Geddes, who had already distinguished himself as an organiser of railway transport in France, was appointed an additional member of the Board of Admiralty, with the title of Controller, and the honorary rank of Vice-Admiral. It was intended that he should be charged with the duty of providing an organisation of the Admiralty, comparable to that which supplied the Army with munitions, and it was at the same time intended to develop and utilise the whole of the shipbuilding resources of the country and to concentrate the organisation under one authority. The shipping position was debated in the House of Lords on May

10, when the Government was asked by Lord Clifford of Chudleigh whether they realised the importance of taking the most drastic steps to keep up the tonnage of our mercantile fleet, so that it should not only keep pace with submarine destruction, but should also be, after the war, in a position paramount to that of any other nation. Lord Curzon in reply said that the result of the naval problem would be that when the war was over, our naval tonnage would materially outnumber the tonnage of other nations. As regards the mercantile marine, taking steamers of 100 tons and upwards, just before the war the United Kingdom and the Dominions possessed 10,124 ships with a tonnage of 20,523,706. In December, 1916, the number of ships of the same class was 9,757, with a tonnage of 19,765,516. The programme for which the Minister of Shipping was pressing would work out at 3,000,000 tons gross per annum. But this programme involved great demands on the supply of workmen and the supply of steel, and the task of adjudicating between this and the other claims of the Army, Agriculture, and Munitions was a very painful operation. He assured the House, however, the Government were taking drastic steps to acquire merchant ships, and there was good ground for hoping that our mercantile fleet would be superior to that of any other nation at the end of the war. The debate was carried on by Lord Beresford, who doubted whether the Government were taking every possible step to defend merchant ships from submarines, and who described the reports of shipping sunk as misleading, and also by Lord Lytton who assured the House in particular that every step was being taken to enable cargoes to be delivered at the first port in England at which they touched, in order to minimise the risk from submarines.

Other events of interest in Parliament during May were the introduction of a Vote of Credit which was moved by Mr. Bonar Law on the 9th. The Vote of Credit was for 500,000,000*l.*, the largest sum which had ever been asked from the House of Commons in a single vote, and it was expected to carry the Government on until about August 1. Dealing with the last vote, he explained that the expenditure for the thirty-five days from April 1 to May was at the rate of 7,450,000*l.* This, however, included advances to the Allies and the Dominions at the rate of 2,000,000*l.* a day. Very welcome help was now being afforded in the financial assistance rendered by the United States to the Allies. Mr. Bonar Law also made some encouraging statements on the progress of the war, and he declared that the offensive which we had prepared during the winter was particularly successful on April 9, and that though progress since then was slower, the enemy was still being pressed by undiminished forces. The two following days were devoted to a Secret Session, for which the House was crowded and animated. In the report communicated to the Press, it was stated that the discussion was opened by Mr. Churchill.

who dealt with the general military and naval situations, made suggestions for meeting the submarine danger, and asked for further information as to marine losses and food supplies. The Prime Minister dealt with the points raised by Mr. Churchill. He cited the opinions of our military chiefs, as well as those of the French in satisfaction at the results of the recent military operations on the Western Front, and explained how the demands of the War Office for further drafts were to be met. He gave an encouraging account of the methods adopted to meet the submarine attack, and pointed out that with judicious economy there need be no alarm as to starvation in this country, and that in 1918 the country would be self-supporting. On the following day Sir Edward Carson deprecated the attacks made on officers of the Navy outside the House. He gave information about the activity of the Admiralty in the organisation of anti-submarine warfare, and the attention given to mercantile shipbuilding. The report of the Committee on the Vote of Credit on which the Secret Session had been taken was unanimously agreed to at the end of the debate. Another interesting debate that occurred in the House during May was that on waraims, which arose on Mr. Snowden's motion welcoming the repudiation by the new Russian Government of all proposals for imperialistic conquest and aggrandisement, and calling for a similar declaration from the British Government. He contended that the Russian Revolution had rendered quite obsolete the Allied Note of January. After other pacifist members had spoken, Lord Robert Cecil replied for the Government, showing how impossible it was to adopt the policy of "no annexations" without qualification. He inquired whether it would be possible to give back Arabia or Armenia to Turkey, or the German colonies in Africa to Germany. He also suggested the difficulties that would arise in the case of Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, and Italia Irredenta. He agreed that there was much that was attractive in the phrase "no peace with the Hohenzollerns," but he thought it was too attractive to be quite prudent as a definition of national policy. As for the cry of "no indemnities," what was to be done about Belgium, about Serbia, and the northern provinces of France, and were we to rule out definitely all reparation for the destruction of peaceful merchant vessels by submarines? He declared emphatically that he was not prepared to do that, and finally that the Allies were determined not to accept a peace which would be no peace. It must be a peace which was just and durable. Mr Asquith followed with a speech which justified annexation for the emancipation of oppressed populations, for securing the union of artificially separated nationalities, and even with some reservation for the maintenance of strategic positions shown to be necessary for defence. He stated that he adhered stoutly to his Guildhall declaration and regarded peace based upon that foundation as the only peace that would justify the sacrifices which we had made. The

question of our war-aims rose again at question time on May 23, when Lord Robert Cecil made a statement to remove a misconception which apparently existed in Petrograd. He repeated that imperialistic aims based on force or conquest were entirely absent from the British programme, and emphasised the fact that the most recent declaration of the reconstituted Government of Russia was in complete harmony with this policy.

A certain amount of attention was devoted, during May, to financial questions. On the 14th, on the second reading of the Consolidated Fund Bill, Sir Frederick Banbury raised the question of the constant excess of expenditure over estimates which he alleged had occurred during the war. Mr Molteno following him urged the necessity of the reorganisation of financial control. Mr. Bonar Law in reply said that he was not satisfied that there was not a great deal of waste which, to a certain extent, was unavoidable in a war, but if those who held a different view thought that they could make any concrete proposal in regard to economy, he would consider it with an open mind. He described the working of the committees appointed to go into the finance of the War Office and the Admiralty with regard to which he said that where things were being done from the point of view of getting them done in the earliest possible time, more money must be spent than where the point of view was that of getting them done at the cheapest price. The financial question were again discussed on May 24, when Mr. Leif Jones declared that the Government by their methods of raising money and their extravagant expenditure, were constantly causing a rise in prices against themselves. The immense sums which they had raised by loan had caused an inflation of prices throughout the country. Mr. Holt complained of the special treatment of shipping under the Finance Bill, which he contended, amounted to something like a breach of faith. Mr. Snowden argued in favour of conscription of wealth, so long as the country pursued a policy of taking life by compulsion and without compensation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply said that both with regard to the taking of men and the taking of wealth, he would prefer the voluntary method, and that if the money needed could be got by voluntary methods, he was certain that more of it would be obtained and for a longer time than by any attempt at conscription, and he asserted that difficult as our position would be at the end of the war, the position of Germany would be much worse. The crux of the debate, he declared, was the criticism of the action of the Government in regard to shipping. He urged that the shipowners had been making immense profits; that the shipping trade was something upon which the life of the country depended, and therefore it ought to be under the control of the Government. The proposal of the Government would be enough even now to give the shipowners reasonable profits on their capital, and he argued that the shipowners had been treated enormously better than shareholders of rail-

ways After allowing the shipowners to make gigantic profits for nearly three years of the war, the Government guaranteed them now practically their pre-war rates.

One of the most alarming developments of this spring was the strike of the engineers. In answer to a question in the House of Commons on May 4, Mr Kellaway stated that a considerable number of engineers were on strike in South Lancashire, and the men's representatives had been told that failing a settlement, the Ministry would bring the case before the Munitions Tribunal, and attempts at conciliation having failed, the Ministry had lodged a complaint against the firm concerned with the Tribunal. The alleged cause of the strike was that the firm in question had been guilty of a breach of the Munitions Act in regard to the procedure to be followed in the introduction of female labour. An early settlement had been hoped for, but was not achieved, and in the following week a statement on the subject was made in the House of Commons. It was admitted that there was a considerable amount of unrest among sections of the engineering trade. This unrest was stated to be due to refusal to recognise the Trade Unions' representatives. It was further a form of protest against a new Schedule of Protected Occupations, designed to replace the original trade card agreement. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers had refused to accept the new agreement until the preceding Saturday. On that night their delegates sent out a telegram urging their members to continue at work, but in many places the men still remained on strike, and a number of others came out. The strikes were quite unauthorised and unsupported by the executives of the Trade Unions, and the Government were convinced that they mainly arose from the activities of a number of men interested in upsetting the authority of the established trade unions. It appeared also that the strike was, to some extent, a protest against the Munitions of War Amendment Bill, which was then before the House and which proposed to introduce the system of the dilution of labour in private firms. On May 10 an important conference of representatives of fifty Trade Unions connected with engineering and shipbuilding was held at the Ministry of Munitions. The meeting passed a resolution deeply deplored the existing unauthorised strike, and appointed a small committee to consider the Munitions Bill, and to confer with the Ministry of Munitions with a view to suggesting possible amendments. A few days later the Government issued a notice calling attention to the unconstitutional nature of the strike, and giving notice that all persons inciting a stoppage of work on munitions were guilty of an offence under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, the penalty for which was penal servitude. At the same time steps were taken to make it clear that the Bill was purely a war measure, and that dilution on private work would cease to exist when the war was over. Meanwhile, an omnibus strike began in London, and a strike of weavers in

the northern counties was threatened. The subject was discussed in the House of Commons on May 14, when Mr. Anderson, a Labour member, warned the Government that the unrest among the workpeople was beginning to amount to a revolutionary feeling, and that unless the Government were very careful, they would bring the country to the verge of revolution. Mr. Kellaway in reply regretted that Mr. Anderson had not said a word about the effect of the prolongation of the strike on the fortunes of our men in France. He declared that his department had dealt with employers with a severity which had not been shown to any body of workmen. On the same day Dr. Addison made a statement on the industrial unrest to a number of Press representatives. He traced the history of dilution of labour, and described the understanding which was arrived at with twenty-eight unions as to the conditions under which dilution could be carried on. The A.S.E. had not seen their way to become a party to this agreement.

Meanwhile, it had become necessary to extend the trades which were controlled by the Ministry of Munitions, and the demand for aeroplanes and for tanks increased the need for a larger supply of skilled labour. He also explained the working of the trade card system which had not been successful, since a number of skilled men had been called up who had not possessed trade cards simply for the reason that they were not in a Union issuing cards. It was evident that the system failed to protect a number of men whom they wanted to protect because some of the big Unions who were not parties to the trade card scheme had a large number of skilled members. Therefore, the Schedule of Protected Occupations was substituted. This schedule had been the subject of the grossest possible misrepresentation. Its basis was that men should be exempted on the ground of skill and indispensability and on no other ground. Dr. Addison went on to explain some of the attempts which the Government had felt compelled to resist. They would not revert to the trade card system, nor would they exempt any man from military service merely because he was a member of a given Union, nor would they agree that before any man should be taken for military service all the other men who had come into the shops in the area by dilution should be taken first, though they had agreed that with regard to class "A" men they would take the dilution men first. Dr. Addison also described the organisation of the Local Complaints Committees and the eight central committees to which disputes in regard to enlistment would be referred. These were composed of a representative of the Admiralty, the district dilution officer of the Ministry of Munitions as chairman, a War Office representative, and an equal number of Trade Union representatives. He went on to say that the present unrest had been engineered by the Shop Stewards Committees, and these committees had serious difficulties with the central Trade Union executives. It

was quite impossible for the Ministry to negotiate on labour matters with any other authorities than the responsible executives of the Unions. There had never been a State Department which had been at greater pains to consult the representatives of labour at every turn than the Ministry of Munitions, but they would not deal with any but the central executives of the unions. In conclusion, he declared that the delay caused by the strike would very seriously affect the continuance of our offensive in France.

The men's leaders held a conference in London on May 15, and in the evening it was announced that it had been decided to open negotiations with the Ministry of Munitions. In some districts the men already showed a tendency to return to work. Dr. Addison when approached with regard to the conference, refused to negotiate with anybody other than the organised representatives of the labour concern, in this case the A.S.E. The situation was again discussed in Parliament on the 17th (on which day the omnibus strike was settled) Mr. Anderson moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to the attitude of the Ministry of Munitions, and quoted large numbers of workmen as saying that the trouble was due to the breaking of pledges by the Government. Dr. Addison then repeated to the House the argument which he had already placed before the Press representatives some days previously. At last, seven men were arrested under the Defence of the Realm Act charged with having impeded the production of war material by the promotion of strikes. They were brought up on the afternoon of the 18th at Bow Street, and were remanded on bail, on undertaking to take no action in the interval with relation to the strike. The Prime Minister made a special request to the A.S.E. to open negotiations, and on Saturday the 19th these began at the Ministry of Munitions. The A.S.E. representatives were accompanied by a deputation from the unofficial strike conference, and it was decided that the strikers should be advised to return to work at once, and that the strike leaders should leave the executive of the Union to conduct negotiations with the Government. No further men were to be arrested and there was to be no victimisation. It was announced immediately that the men were beginning to return to work, and by the middle of the week there was a general resumption of work throughout the country, while the Ministry of Munitions carried on a conference with Trade Union representatives with regard to the question of dilution and the amendment of the Munitions of War Amendment Bill. When the arrested strike leaders appeared again before the magistrates at Bow Street, the charges were withdrawn, and the accused were released after having signed an undertaking to adhere to the settlement arranged with the Government. At Liverpool engineers stated that should a dilution clause of the Munitions of War Amendment Bill be submitted to the House of Commons they would immediately withdraw their labour, but for the time being they decided to return to work.

On May 26 the Prime Minister in the course of a speech on the submarine menace and its reaction on the food position already mentioned, made an important announcement on the investigation of industrial unrest. He stated that the termination of the recent strike offered a good opportunity for renewing the labour position, and announced that the Government proposed to divide the country into seven areas, and to appoint a commission consisting of a labour representative, an employer and an impartial chairman to investigate the causes of unrest in each area. They were to inquire into the war emergency legislation, and to make recommendations for the minimising of unrest established in the shipbuilding and engineering trades during the war, and would advise the Government whether it was desirable to make administrative or legislative changes.

During the month of May great interest was taken in a series of important speeches by General Smuts. At a dinner in his honour by both Houses of Parliament on May 15, General Smuts reminded his audience of an occasion when, during the Boer War, a small force under his command failed to seize a passing train, and later he learned that the only freight on that train was Lord French. "If I had not missed that chance Lord French would have been, on that occasion, my guest, no doubt a very welcome though a somewhat embarrassing guest. Now to-night I am his guest." He declared that as the struggle in South Africa had laid a new basis on which they built the larger South Africa of to-day, so he believed that the spirit of comradeship born on the battle-fields among men of all parts of the Empire would be far more powerful than any instrument of Government we could erect in the future. He alluded to the peculiar character of the great Commonwealth to which he and his audience alike belonged; that Commonwealth was scattered all over the world. It was not a compact territory, and was dependent for its very existence on world-wide communications which must be maintained if the Empire were not to go to pieces. In the years of peace Germany had settled on these communications, but now the whole world outside Europe had been cleared of the enemy, and he hoped that when peace came to be made they would bear in mind not only Central Europe, but the whole British Empire, and would make no arrangements which would jeopardise the valuable results which had been obtained. He went on to discuss the problem of the future government of the Commonwealth, usually called the British Empire, and insisted that there were two potent factors which must be relied on. The first was the hereditary kingship. He declared that the institution of a republic in Great Britain would make the unity of the Empire impossible, and that the kingship which we had here was not really very different from a hereditary republic. He also insisted that the Imperial Cabinet should continue, and should meet more frequently, and that it should have a greater

share in foreign policy, which should be conducted under a less secret and a more democratic system.

On May 22 a dinner was given to General Smuts at the Savoy Hotel by men who were or had been associated with South Africa. In answer to the speech proposing his health, General Smuts spoke of the importance of attaining national unity in South Africa. Many people there, and not only the Dutch, preferred to stand aside from the great currents which were carrying South Africa forward. There they wished to create a blend out of various nationalities, a nation which would embrace various traits. It was still more important to do that because South Africa was not yet a white man's country. There were people, he said, in South Africa, who were not certain that the white experiment there would be a success, because of the overwhelming black population, but he declared that South Africa was going to make an attempt on the basis of certain axioms. Firstly, that there should be no inter-mixture of white and black blood; secondly, that in the dealings with the black, they would proceed on the basis of the Christian moral code; thirdly, that an attempt should be made to achieve native self-government on entirely different lines from that which applies to the white. Therefore, the ideal before South Africa was to create considerable native communities with independent self-governing institutions for the native populations. He pointed out that one great danger of the future would be the possibility of training, in the tropical areas of Africa, one of the most powerful armies that the world has ever known. He hoped that one result of the war would be that military training of natives in that area should be absolutely forbidden. On the 30th General Smuts made a memorable speech in which he expressed British sympathy with the Revolution in Russia, and pointed out how on this new freedom depended the obligation of the great democracies of the world to secure the same boon for down-trodden Belgium and Serbia.

A minor event which caused some excitement during May was the suspension of racing. The Government had announced the total prohibition of race meetings, and a protest against this policy was expressed in the House of Lords on the 24th by Lord d'Abernon and Viscount Chaplin. Lord Curzon in reply said that the reason which had actuated the Government was the position in regard to food supply, and it would give the Government very great pleasure should they be able to relax the present racing restrictions.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced his Budget into the House of Commons on May 3. The expenditure for the year had been 2,198,113,000*l.*, showing an excess of 372,722,000*l.* over the estimate of the previous year. The total advances since the beginning of the war to the Allies had been 828,000,000*l.* and to the Dominions 142,000,000*l.* The revenue for the year had exceeded the estimate by 71,153,000*l.* The National Debt

now stood at 3,854,000,000*l.*; from which, however, might be deducted the advances to the Allies and Dominions. Our total national expenditure during the war was 4,318,000,000*l.*, of which fully 26 per cent had been provided out of revenue. Our total daily expenditure was 6,275,000*l.* No new taxation was proposed, but increases were made in the entertainments tax, in the tobacco duty (increased by 1*s.* 10*d.* a lb.), and in the excess profits tax which was raised from 60 to 80 per cent.

The following table shows the estimated revenue for 1917-18, as compared with the receipts for 1916-17.—

	Estimate for 1917-18 on Basis of Proposed Taxation	Receipts in 1916-17.
Customs - - - - -	70,750,000	70,561,000
Excise - - - - -	34,950,000	36,380,000
Estate, etc., Duties - - - - -	29,000,000	31,232,000
Stamps - - - - -	8,000,000	7,878,000
Land Tax - - - - -	650,000	610,000
House Duty - - - - -	1,950,000	1,940,000
Income Tax (including super-tax) - - - - -	224,000,000	205,933,900
Excess Profits Duty - - - - -	200,000,000	139,920,000
Land Value Duties - - - - -	400,000	521,000
Postal Service - - - - -	24,200,000	24,350,000
Telegraph Service - - - - -	3,250,000	3,350,000
Telephone Service - - - - -	6,250,000	6,400,000
Crown Lands - - - - -	600,000	650,000
Receipt from Sundry Loans, etc. - - - - -	7,500,000	8,056,000
Miscellaneous - - - - -	27,100,000	16,517,000
Total - - - - -	£638,600,000	£573,428,000

The following table shows the estimated expenditure of 1917-18, compared with the issues of 1916-17:—

	Estimate for 1917-18	Exchequer Issue, 1916-17.
National Debt Services - - - - -	211,500,000	127,250,000
Payments to Local Taxation Accounts, etc. - - - - -	9,700,000	9,896,000
Other Consolidated Fund Services - - - - -	1,695,000	1,974,000
Army - - - - -	15,000	15,000
Navy - - - - -	17,000	17,000
Ministry of Munitions (including Ordnance Factories) - - - - -	1,000	1,000
Civil Services - - - - -	61,221,000	54,113,000
Customs and Excise, and Inland Revenue - - - - -	5,249,000	4,728,000
Post Office Services - - - - -	25,980,000	26,454,000
Votes of Credit - - - - -	1,975,000,000	1,973,665,000
Total - - - - -	£2,290,381,000	£2,198,113,000

The estimated revenue being 638,600,000*l.* and the estimated expenditure 2,290,381,000*l.*, the final balance sheet, 1917-18, showed a deficit of 1,651,781,000*l.* After some discussion and suggestions, the Budget resolutions were agreed to.

During June important steps were taken to put a stop to profiteering, beginning with the wholesale supplies of meat. The Meat Sales Order, 1917, provided that salesmen could sell only to a retail butcher or a consumer. This was intended to eliminate jobbing transactions, and the amount which could be charged on reselling was not to exceed 3d. a stone above the price at which the carcase, side or quarter, was bought if it was sold whole, or 4d. a stone if the carcase were cut into smaller joints. It was further announced that the Ministry of Food was prepared to fix maximum prices for retail salesmen, but that the technical difficulties in compiling a schedule of retail prices applicable to varying conditions and trade prices had been found to be so considerable that some delay was inevitable. In the middle of the month great satisfaction was caused by the announcement that the post of Food Controller had been accepted by Lord Rhondda. He had been known, when Sir David Thomas, as an exceptionally able captain of industry, and had, it will be remembered, accepted under Mr Lloyd George's reconstructed Government the post of President of the Local Government Board. There he had been pressing for the institution of a Ministry of Health, and it was understood that he had been very unwilling to give up that project for the difficulties of the post of Food Controller, and that a promise had been made to him that the plan of a Ministry of Health should not be allowed to drop after he left the Local Government Board. Lord Rhondda authorised a statement of his policy in which he stated that a man who made a profit by the necessities of his country at such an hour of peril was no better than a black-mailer, and ought to be treated as such. He proposed first to endeavour to secure a deduction in the price of bread, and proposed to avail himself of the help of Local Authorities in distribution, and also of the advice of the co-operative societies. Lord Rhondda began his new duties on June 19.

Great dissatisfaction had been expressed with regard to the price of imported meat. A correspondence in *The Times*, in which Lord Inchcape took part, had pointed out that beef was sold in Australia to the British Government at 4½d. per pound and mutton at 5½d. and that they could be delivered in London at 6½d. and 6½d. per pound respectively, prices which bore, of course, no sort of comparison to those charged at that time by retailers. It was, however, pointed out that so much of this imported meat was needed for the Army that the supplies for the home market were extremely short, and that it was rather in connexion with home-fed meat that excessive profits prevailed.

The question had been raised as to whether the war bread was not the cause of various internal ailments which were prevalent, and Lord Rhondda immediately arranged for an inquiry into the matter by experts. Lord Rhondda also took over the Oils and Fats Department which had been attached to the Ministry of Munitions, and so brought the whole margarine

supply under his direct control. At the very end of the month an Order in Council conferred on him the same powers as the Admiralty, Army Council, and Ministry of Munitions already possessed, for requisitioning and controlling prices

The events in Russia had exercised some influence on Socialists of the extremer type in England, and at the beginning of June there took place at Leeds a conference convened by the Independent Labour Party, which had definitely taken up an anti-war attitude, and the British Socialist Party, from which the pro-war members had recently seceded. At this conference the chairman, Mr. Smillie, stated that it was impossible that peace should come otherwise than by negotiation, and that Russia was entitled to urge this country to state clearly its aims in the war and its terms of peace. He believed that if it were made clear that the Allies were only aiming at giving opportunities to the peoples of Europe to govern themselves in their own way, the German Government would be forced by public opinion to negotiate, or the German people would take the step which had been taken by Russia. The first resolution was one congratulating the Russian people on their revolution, and in moving it, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald took occasion to speak of the loss of liberty and the growth of reaction in England. But the chief interest in the conference centred in the last resolution, which called upon the bodies represented to establish at once in every district councils of workmen's and soldiers' delegates, a resolution obviously influenced by the recent events in Russia. The resolution, although there was some opposition expressed in speeches, was carried almost unanimously. This conference had an imposing appearance, and was in some respects similar to the annual conference held by the Labour Party, but it was stated that many of the delegates came without selection or instructions by the bodies they purported to represent, and although the conference created a certain amount of attention at the time, it exercised very slight influence on the subsequent course of events

The sailors' representatives at the conference had protested against the abandonment of any claim to indemnities, and in the following week the Sailors' and Firemen's Union held a special conference at which great indignation was expressed at the manner in which the Leeds Conference had treated the proposal of the seamen with regard to restitution for the murders of their comrades by the commanders of the U-boats, and the special conference finally resolved that members of the National Sailors' and Firemen's Union would refuse to sail on any boat on which peace delegates should be carried, unless the latter would give an undertaking in writing that they would demand from the Germans restitution to the relatives of seamen murdered by the crews of German submarines.

Turning to the more direct relations of the war to the internal history of England, we have to report that during June

the submarine menace continued to decrease. The following table indicates the sailings and sinkings for the five weeks of June.—

SUBMARINE ACTIVITY DURING THE MONTH OF JUNE

	Week Ending				
	May 27	June 3	June 10.	June 17	June 24
Arrivals at United Kingdom Ports -	2,719	2,693	2,767	2,897	2,876
Sailings from United Kingdom Ports	2,768	2,642	2,822	2,893	2,923
British Vessels Sunk—					
(a) 1,600 tons or over -	18	15	21	24	20
(b) Under 1,600 tons -	2	3	9	4	6
Unsuccessfully Attacked -	22	15	16	29	15
Fishing Vessels Sunk -	2	5	6	—	—

These returns showed a remarkable diminution of the "record" for April, and indicated that for the time being the submarines were not in a position to realise the hopes which had been formed of their prowess by the German Government

A good deal of annoyance, however, was caused by a series of daylight air-raids. The first of these occurred on June 13, when about fifteen enemy aeroplanes bombed the East end of London for about a quarter of an hour, and ninety-seven persons were killed and 439 injured. One bomb fell on an infant school, killing ten and injuring fifty children. The raiders were engaged by the guns of the East London defences, and a number of British aeroplanes were sent up as soon as the enemy was reported off the coast, but it was generally felt that the defence had hardly been equal to the attack, and the disturbance was greater because the raid came on London without any warning from the authorities. The question of giving some warning to the public was discussed on the following day in the House of Lords, when Lord Derby took the view that it was doubtful whether it was desirable to give notice of a forthcoming raid, as such notice might possibly bring more people into the street. In the House of Commons, Sir Frederick Banbury asked whether a warning might not be given by the ringing of the bell of St. Paul's, and Mr. Bonar Law replied that means to procure protection against air-raids were occupying the most earnest attention of the departments concerned. A demand began to be expressed for reprisals, and the whole question was discussed in the House of Lords on June 26, when Lord Strachan suggested to the Secretary of State for War the desirability of creating a separate department for the defence of London, the institution of a regular air patrol, and the following of every raid which proved injurious to the civilian population of this country by a raid on a far larger scale directed towards some German town. Lord Sydenham strongly advocated the institution of regular warnings in order that per-

sons who wished to take shelter could have an opportunity of doing so, and several members spoke in favour of reprisals. Lord Derby, in replying, said that it was not desirable to have a separate department for London, as the defence of London against aircraft must be part and parcel of the defence of the kingdom as a whole. He urged that it was very undesirable to inform the Germans of the precise nature of the defence measures which were taken, but declared that every care was being exercised consistent with the supply of aeroplanes to the front. With regard to reprisals, he said "We must have a distinct military objective, something by which we can achieve not only the killing of soldiers, but the destruction of munition works and factories for the construction of guns." He held, therefore, that the idea of "an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth in the way of massacring women and children" was repugnant to the nation. He stated that the question of giving warning was very debatable, as there would be a great risk that the cry of "Wolf" would be heard too often, and therefore, in the end, there might be more danger and less preparation to meet it than at the present time. Lord Montagu warned the House that the country must look forward to air-raids becoming more frequent and more serious, and that the Germans had a perfect right to raid London as it was the chief centre of the production of munitions. The great need was for more aeroplanes, and for placing the whole air service under the supreme command of a single head. The employment of air machines, he insisted, was, before the end of the war, going to be a prominent issue, and everything should be subordinate to the manufacture of aeroplanes. Lord Montagu's warnings of increasing severity of air-raids was borne out by the great attack on London, which occurred on July 7. A squadron of at least twenty enemy aeroplanes flew over sea and land, and from a height of not less than 5,000 feet released a large number of bombs, which killed thirty-four people and injured 139 others. They got back to the sea without loss, though four were subsequently brought down during the pursuit. The enemy arrived about half-past ten in the morning, and the sight of the squadron manoeuvring over London was one of the most exciting spectacles which the inhabitants of that city had yet experienced in the war. The public was entirely calm, and there was no panic, but the readiness of the people to take shelter indicated that the official view that warnings were undesirable was almost certainly mistaken. On the following Monday in the House of Commons, the Home Secretary explained under what circumstances private warnings were given to the naval and military establishments, the police and fire brigades, the hospitals and certain factories. He still held that public warnings would be extremely difficult, might even be given in cases where the raiders were driven off before reaching London, and would cause a general stoppage of work for some hours. He was,

however, prepared to state that the Government would reconsider the whole matter and see whether it would be possible to give notice of a raid when it was immediately impending. The House of Lords debated the subject on July 10, when Lord Tenterden urged that the Government should greatly increase the manufacture of aeroplanes, and complained of the bad system of defence of London. Lord Derby replied that everything possible was being done to enlarge the output of aeroplanes, and that week by week the increase was stupendous. At the same time, they had not enough to meet the claims of all the theatres of war, and the relative value to be given to the demands of these different theatres and to the defence of this country was a problem which gave rise to the most anxious thought.

Towards the end of June an interesting statement was made in the House of Commons by Dr. Addison on the vote for the Ministry of Munitions. Dr. Addison described how the Ministry had "delivered the goods" to the Army, and spoke, too, of the work of the Ministry in stimulating the home production of essential materials, in supplying the farmers with artificial manure, in combating industrial diseases, in ameliorating the conditions of labour, in introducing new business methods, and in preparing for the reconstruction of industry after the war. He gave some very striking statistics of the production of munitions. For instance, the capacity for the production of high explosives was twenty-eight times as great in March, 1917, as it had been two years previously. Our capacity for the production of machine guns weekly was more than twenty times greater than it was two years previously. The supply of aeroplanes was being immensely increased, and tanks of the new designs were coming forward excellently, while the output of small arms had become so abundant that the country had been able to supply all its own requirements. One of the most interesting parts of his speech was that which told of the reclaiming of vital industries of which the Germans had acquired control before the war. The country would, in the following year, have a capacity for steel production more than 50 per cent. greater than before the war. We should be able to produce fertilisers at home instead of importing them. We were now producing our own tungsten, steps were in hand to increase the production of aluminium by 45 per cent., and further, a process had been discovered by which great quantities of potash could be obtained, a substance for which this country had been hitherto completely dependent on Germany. Dr. Addison drew the conclusion that the war had revealed that a certain measure of central control and common direction might place at the disposal of individual effort opportunities otherwise unopened, and that with regard to the question of capital and labour both parties must in the future have a common interest in the introduction of improved methods. This latter question was dealt with in an interim re-

port issued on the same day, June 28, by a sub-committee of the Reconstruction Committee on the relations between employers and employed. Of this committee, Mr. Whitley, the Chairman of Committees in the House of Commons, was chairman, and for this reason the report, which subsequently attracted a great deal of attention, is known as the Whitley Report. The report stated that the war almost enforced some reconstruction of industry, and that in that reconstruction it was desirable to secure the largest possible measure of co-operation between employers and employed, therefore the sub-committee advocated the establishment for each industry of a body representative of both employers and workpeople, such organisation to be named a Joint Industrial Council. It was suggested that these Councils should meet at regular intervals, and should consider among other questions, (1) The settlement of the general principles governing the conditions of employment, including the methods of fixing, paying, and readjusting wages. (2) Means of securing to the workpeople security of earnings and employment (3) Technical education and training, industrial research, and the improvement of processes, machinery, and organisation, and appropriate questions relating to management, with special reference to co-operation in carrying new ideas into effect, and full consideration of the workpeople's point of view in relation to them. It was advocated that in addition to the National Industrial Councils for each industry subordinate bodies should also be instituted consisting of (a) district councils and (b) works committees representative of the management and of the workers employed.

Among other subjects debated by the House of Commons in June was the Bill to enable His Majesty in Council to carry into effect covenants with allied or other States as to the mutual liability of British subjects and the subjects of those States to military service. The Bill on its second reading on June 8 was strenuously opposed by the pacifist group on the ground that it was undesirable that this country should break with its long tradition of giving asylum to foreign refugees. The discussion was closed and the motion for the rejection of the Bill was lost by a majority of 131 in a very small House. The Bill was further discussed on June 15, when a Labour member, Mr. Crooks, made a fiery speech, charging the opposition in the House with encouraging the Germans to go on. He had previously stated that he had just come from an inquest on fifteen small children killed by the air-raid, and had seen the grief of the parents, and that this Bill was to help to put a stop to such scenes. This spirited interruption deeply moved the House, and the Bill was henceforth in smooth waters. On June 12 the Prime Minister received the Commissioners who had been appointed to inquire into the cause of labour unrest as already described, and delivered to them an important speech on the scope and character of their inquiry. He said that the industrial machine had been working at exceptionally high pressure,

while at the same time 5,000,000 of men in the prime of life had been withdrawn from industry; consequently, there had been over-strain and exhaustion and all the irritation that inevitably ensued. The achievements had been worthy, but all the same there had been trouble and some friction, and the function of the Commissioners was to investigate the causes of the disquiet. The Government wished the inquiry to be thorough and impartial and that it should not be conducted in too formal a manner. The Commissioners should see for themselves and get to know what was really happening. He strongly advocated that the investigations should take place in private, since witnesses would speak with much more freedom if they knew that their revelations would not be made public. He also urged that the recommendations of the Commissioners should be made at the earliest practicable date, and that they should not merely state causes of unrest, but should make their own recommendations as to the way of dealing with them. He went on to say that there was one cause of unrest which the Government proposed to deal with at once, and that was the high price of food, and the suggestion that this was due to profiteering. The Cabinet had already started a very searching investigation on that subject.

The Corn Production Bill was further discussed on June 13 when the House went into Committee on the financial resolution in regard to the Bill. The President of the Board of Agriculture reminded the House of the reason for the introduction of the Bill, namely, the necessity of growing more cereals in this country and of guaranteeing the farmers by means of a minimum price against possible loss involved in the production of cereals. The Bill was criticised in the discussion that followed on the grounds that it would be difficult to find labour, that it could not come into operation in time to provide a real answer to the submarine menace, and that the proposal of a minimum wage of 25s. a week would increase the cost of production so greatly that the farmers would not profit by a guaranteed minimum price. Mr Runciman, while he stated that he would vote for the resolution, believed that it would be a more businesslike transaction to extend the powers of the Wheat Commission, who had now control of the whole of our imported wheat, so that they could purchase on contract prices declared beforehand for a period of four years such of our home-grown wheat as was in proper condition for milling. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in replying, said that the Government had already made definite pledges with regard to the Bill which it intended to see carried out. This did not interfere with the adoption of modifications which were not antagonistic to these principles. At the end of the debate the resolution was carried by 196 votes to 21.

On the 14th there was a further debate on the British Trade Corporation, and in anticipation of criticism, the Government

explained that the Corporation was not to be placed in any preferential position. Sir Albert Stanley, the President of the Board of Trade, showed that there was need of an organisation with great financial resources from which the struggling manufacturer trying to establish a new industry could obtain expert business advice, in addition to longer credit and more financial help than the British banker would give. The debate revealed a good deal of back-bench criticism, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer found it necessary to intervene in order to point out that there should be some means by which young men without capital could have a chance of getting credit which would enable them to establish new lines of business. He gave the House clearly to understand that the Government were ready to give the same facilities to any similar body of men who were able to undertake to do the same kind of work.

On the 21st there was an important debate in the House of Commons on man-power, when the subject of the recall of discharged soldiers to the Army was raised by Mr. Pringle, who referred to the position created by the Review of Exceptions Act. He charged the recruiting authorities with having called up the maimed, the blind, the halt, and the mute. Mr. Macpherson replied for the War Office. He emphatically denied that crippled men were being called up to fight in the trenches, and declared that any man who was sufficiently well to earn his livelihood in a civil capacity could be used in the Army. He offered on behalf of the Government to undertake that any men who had served abroad and had been discharged for wounds or sickness, should be finally discharged, and also stated that the Government were willing to appoint a small parliamentary committee to examine into the working of the Act. Mr. Asquith expressed satisfaction with the promise of a committee, and contended that the operation of the Act had excited widespread discontent. Following him, member after member rose to give his experience of the working of medical boards, and later in the sitting, Mr. Clement Edwards called attention to the grave discontent existing throughout the country at the fact that there were in civil life hundreds of thousands of young unmarried men of military age who could be spared. The debate showed a very considerable dissatisfaction with the action of the military authorities who, it was contended, had in many cases, acted illegally and had exhibited a bullying spirit towards the men with whom they were dealing, finally, as stated above, the Government found it necessary to make a concession to the spirit of discontent evinced by the House. The committee was subsequently appointed on June 26 to inquire into and report on the whole working of the Military Service (Review of Exceptions) Act, 1917. The same subject was made an issue in the election for the Abercromby division of Liverpool, where Lord Stanley, the son of the Secretary of War, was the Coalition candidate. It was found necessary that Mr.

Macpherson should go down into the area to speak on behalf of Lord Stanley and in support of the policy of the Government in relation to recruiting men for the Army. The independent candidate, Mr Hughes, declared that the interests of discharged soldiers was not being adequately dealt with by the Government. Lord Stanley was returned on June 28 by a majority of 1,430.

An interesting statement was made in the House of Lords on June 27 by Lord Milner, when he explained the steps which the Government were taking to place a sufficient supply of labour on the land to ensure the carrying out of their food production programme. He announced that the Government had added between seventy and eighty thousand men to the people available for agricultural work. The sources from which the new supplies of labour were to come were. (1) Prisoners of War. (2) Interned enemy aliens. (3) Upwards of 40,000 men had been released from the home defence forces, 12,000 had been lent for the hay harvest, and 5,000 more were promised for the corn harvest. Also 22,000 men already in the Army who were helping on the land and who were to have been called to the Army were to continue their agricultural work unless they could be replaced by men of the same standard, and a large additional number of men, some of special agricultural experience, were to be furnished week by week from the beginning of July to the end of September. These additions had not, he admitted, fully solved the problem, but he trusted that what had been done would put new energy and hope into those engaged in the effort to render this country largely independent of foreign food supplies during the war.

The two most important questions, however, dealt with by Parliament during the months of June and July were, first, the proposed Stockholm Conference, and second, the report on the operations in Mesopotamia. The former we will leave until later in order to give a complete record of the negotiations at one time.

On the 26th the long-awaited report of the Commission on the Operations in Mesopotamia was issued. The full text of this document will be found on p. 56. In the House of Lords on July 3 Lord Hardinge, Viceroy of India from 1910-16 and at that time permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, replied to the criticisms passed upon him by the Mesopotamia Commissioners. He declared that the Commission did not give adequate weight to the risks and preoccupations of the Government of India during 1914 and 1915. As to the advance on Baghdad, the full telegraphic correspondence showed that the Government of India was strongly opposed to an advance without reinforcements. It might be contended that they ought to have maintained their veto, but he asked whether such a course would have been justified in view of the obvious political advantages in the capture of Baghdad, of the strong pressure from home, and of the unanimous military opinion in favour of it.

He declared that the inadequacy of the river transport available was only revealed when it was too late to make it good, though everything possible was done to remedy it, and as to the medical breakdown, he could only confess to having been completely deceived by the misleading reports received from the Front and to that extent he must accept full responsibility. The moment the truth dawned upon him, he made every effort within his power to remedy the situation. Summing up, Lord Hardinge pointed to his thirty-seven years of honourable service under the Crown, and insisted that, if he had failed in his duty, such a verdict should only be given in the light of India's military effort taken as a whole and of the internal situation in that vast empire. Lord Curzon, after a tribute to the dignity and candour of Lord Hardinge's speech, recommended the House to avoid any discussion on the merits of the case until the set debate on the whole question.

On the following day in the House of Commons Mr Austen Chamberlain was asked a series of questions arising out of the Mesopotamia Report. He stated that Major Carter would suffer no injury in his career on account of his efforts to secure a remedy for the medical arrangements in Mesopotamia. He also explained that some time ago he had formed the opinion that the standard of accommodation in the hospitals for British and Indian troops must be improved. On the eve of the Mesopotamia debates on July 11, the Government announced in both Houses that they had decided to hold a judicial inquiry into the conduct of all persons, soldiers and civilians, affected by the report. Mr. Bonar Law explained to the House of Commons that the Government had been confronted with unusual difficulties in dealing with the report. It had to be borne in mind that the Mesopotamia Commission was not a judicial body. Procedure by court-martial was not possible because civilians could not be brought before such a court. It was proposed that the court should consist of three officers and three persons holding high judicial office. The case would be presented by the law officers of the Crown, or by counsel nominated by the Attorney-General. The parties interested would be entitled to be represented and to have their expenses defrayed out of public funds. The court would not have power to punish, but only to report to the Army Council which in the case of soldiers could inflict punishment by court-martial. With regard to the civilians, the Government would take action in consequence of the report. On the following day the Mesopotamia debate took place, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain surprised the House by announcing that he had resigned the office of Secretary of State for India. He said that he did not dispute the decision to appoint a judicial tribunal to try the charges of the report, but that under those circumstances it was not possible that he should continue to be the head of an office in which his conduct had been censured. After this announcement Mr. Chamberlain

repudiated warmly any suggestion that General Sir Edmund Barrow, the Military Secretary at the India Office, had exceeded his powers in recommending an expedition to Mesopotamia. In the course of a minute history of the correspondence on the possibility of providing reinforcements, Mr. Chamberlain referred to the attacks made on Mr. Asquith and his colleagues for deliberately embarking on a hazardous gamble. The attacks, he said, were based upon a mutilated telegram, and while he did not impute misrepresentation to the Commission, he declared that no man could safely be charged on paraphrased extracts. He then summed up the case for authorising the advance on Baghdad, and, passing to the collapse of the hospital arrangements, admitted that he would not say one word to excuse or palliate the horrible breakdown. His personal plea was that he was entirely ignorant of it until the damage had been done. Mr. Chamberlain protested vigorously against efforts to cast odium on Lord Hardinge because the military administration to which he trusted broke down under great strain, and declared that it would be an evil day for the country if a great public servant was to be hounded out of public life without trial and without a hearing in answer to the clamours of an ill-informed and passionate mob. The debate was continued by the Attorney-General, who explained that the procedure of the Commission was from the judicial standpoint extremely unsatisfactory. He also insisted that they were bound to find a tribunal before which both officers and civilians could be heard, and that they had accordingly fallen back upon the "Barrett Act," which provided the necessary machinery for dealing with both sets of cases. If the proposal was not acceptable to the House, he announced that the Government would be willing to set up by statute a tribunal to deal with both sets of cases. Sir John Simon contested much of the Attorney-General's legal argument, and urged that the Government should propose a method by which under a short and agreed statute the necessary charges could be formulated so that they might be overcome or proved in accordance with the elementary principles of plain justice. Later in the evening, Mr. Balfour announced that in deference to the general feeling the Government would proceed by a new statute and not by the "Barrett Act." Mr. Balfour also announced that Lord Hardinge had sent his resignation to him but he had refused to accept it. A similar debate took place on the same day in the House of Lords, but no point of any importance emerged which was not discussed in the Commons.

On the following day the most important speeches were made in the House of Commons by Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George. The former began by criticising the decision of the Government to set up a statutory tribunal to deal with the cases of those who had been censured by the Commission. To his mind it was absurd to submit to two or three judges the question whether this or that statesman, soldier, or sailor, had

formed or acted upon a mistaken judgment of policy. He knew of only one tribunal suited to try a question of that kind, and that was the House of Commons. Mr. Asquith expressed his profound regret at Mr. Austen Chamberlain's resignation, and then passed to examine in detail one aspect of the report, namely, the decision of the Government of which he was the head, to sanction the advance on Baghdad. He declared emphatically that he could not recall any step taken in the war which was more completely warranted by every relevant consideration of policy and strategy, and which was more strongly fortified in advance by an absolute concurrence of expert authority. He said that had the Government vetoed the advance it would have been said that they were a set of timorous, pigeon-livered politicians, fearful to take risk, thinking of their own skins. His final point was that all this retrospection was likely to have an injurious effect upon the conduct of the war, and he ended with Burke's famous appeal, "Let us pass on, for God's sake let us pass on." The Prime Minister wound up the debate. He said that there had been undoubted mismanagement, and thousands of gallant lives had been lost under conditions of unspeakable torture. Someone or something was to blame, but he insisted on the necessity of a judicial inquiry before a man was deprived of his rank and turned out of the Army. The Prime Minister then reminded the members with great solemnity that at the most critical stage of the war, with 20,000,000 men interlocked in deadly conflict for the future of the world, they were discussing methods of dealing with the findings of a Commission which had nothing to do with the practical prosecution of the war. The debate in the House of Lords took somewhat similar lines. Lord Beresford put the question, "Is anybody going to be brought to book?" Lord Curzon replied for the Government and said that although he agreed that the report was a tragic record of combined heroism, incompetence, and suffering, he regretted that the demand for punishment had almost degenerated into the witch-hunting of barbaric times. The issue was raised again in the House of Commons on July 18, when Mr. Bonar Law announced at question time that the Government had decided not to proceed further with their former proposals as to the judicial inquiry, but that the soldiers would be dealt with in the ordinary way by the Army Council, while on the representations of Mr. Balfour, they had also decided that it would be detrimental to the public interest if the Foreign Office should be deprived of the services of Lord Hardinge. They had therefore refused Lord Hardinge's resignation which had been proffered for the third time. Mr. Dillon inquired whether an early day would be given to the House to review the decision. Mr. Bonar Law refused on the ground that sufficient time had already been occupied in the two-days' debate on the subject. Mr. Dillon then in the course of the same evening moved the adjournment

of the House as a matter of urgency. Mr. Balfour accepted full responsibility for the retaining of Lord Hardinge in the public service, and declared that he would not permit the perpetration of a gross injustice on any of his subordinates. He spoke of the extreme hardship Lord Hardinge had suffered in not having his case brought before a judicial tribunal, and declared that he would be completely cleared could such a course of action be taken. The leaders of the Opposition took no part in the debate. The back bench members who spoke were almost all hostile to Mr. Balfour's attitude, but when the division was taken there were only 81 in favour of the adjournment and 176 against. This was the somewhat inconclusive end, as far as Parliament was concerned, of one of the most unfortunate events of the war.

An interesting announcement was made in the House of Commons on June 18. General Smuts' capacity had made so great an impression on the country, that it was felt to be held desirable that he should defer his return to South Africa and should remain in England and give what assistance he could to the Government. Mr. Bonar Law announced that the War Cabinet, in order to avail themselves of the expert military knowledge and experience of General Smuts, had invited him to attend their meetings during his stay in the country. His precise position was elucidated on the 25th, when Mr. Bonar Law replied to a question from Mr. Herbert Samuel that if matters relating solely to domestic affairs were under discussion by the Cabinet, General Smuts himself had laid it down that he would not intervene in the discussion.

An event of some interest which occurred towards the end of June was the Conference between British and German delegates as to the treatment of prisoners of war. The meetings began on June 25 and England was represented by Lord Newton, Lieut.-General Sir Herbert Belfield and Sir Robert Younger.

The increasing amount of Government Control over industry was evidenced during this month by the new proposals for the control of the cotton trade. The Board of Trade had summoned a meeting of representatives of the various cotton interests, when it was decided that the Liverpool Cotton Exchange should re-open under the conditions to be framed by the directors of the Liverpool Cotton Association with a view to avoiding all further cotton speculation. It was also decided to set up at once a Board of Control for the cotton trade to include representatives of spinners, manufacturers, importers and distributors and of the principal associations of cotton operatives, together with representatives of the Board of Trade. Following on this, the Board of Trade made an order forbidding any person to deal in raw cotton except by a licence granted by the Board, the administration of the Order to be carried out by the newly appointed Cotton Control Board.

The final report on the raid upon *The Field* office in relation

to an explosive named Halakite, was issued as a Parliamentary paper early in June. Mr Justice Shearman who, with Professor Pope, was responsible for the report, stated that the explosive substances submitted to the Allied Governments under the name of Halakite were of no value. The refusal of the War Office to issue the licence to the White Power Syndicate to trade in explosives was justified, and there was no foundation for any of the grievances or complaints presented against any officials of His Majesty's Government.

The end of the month was signalled by a speech at Glasgow by the Prime Minister, in which he defined more directly than had ever been done before the terms on which Britain was prepared to make peace. He made it plain that the independence of Belgium and Serbia must be restored and their people compensated, while Mesopotamia and Armenia must be freed from the Turks and entrusted to more equitable hands to be chosen by the Peace Congress; the wishes and interests of the inhabitants of the German colonies must be the dominant factor in settling their future government. He declared that we must have the guarantee against a repetition of Germany's crime which would come through the destruction of Prussian military power, or better still from the democratisation of the German Government. In this speech he dealt with the true bearing of the Russian Revolution on the progress of the Allies towards their goal. It had postponed complete victory, but it had made victory more sure and of a better quality. Only two conditions did the Prime Minister lay down as essential to victory. First, the submarine attack must be defeated or kept within reasonable bounds, and second, the nation must maintain its morale. It was not fair to the Army, he went on, for people at home to be always grumbling and grousing. After all, everyone was doing his best. He ended with these words, "My appeal is this: that we should continue to fight for the great goal of international right, and international justice, so that never again can brute force sit on the throne of justice, nor barbaric strength wield the sceptre of right."

From Glasgow Mr. Lloyd George went on to Dundee, where he made another invigorating speech when he received the freedom of the City. In the course of the speech, after referring in a very optimistic manner to the fact that the German Army was unable to fight except in trenches and had been driven underground like "rabbits," he went on to lay stress on the importance of unity in warfare and of the cheerful acceptance of restrictions which, he declared, could not yet be regarded as privations. He admitted that the country was entitled to ask from the Government that it would not permit the burdens of the people to be increased by what is called profiteering. "In peace," he said, "profiteering is unfair and in war it is an outrage," and the Government intended to deal very drastically with unfair profiteering in food. If necessary, they would even

go to the extent of resorting to the Exchequer in order to see that at any rate the price of bread was within the compass of the bulk of the people

It will be convenient to discuss next the food question during the month of July. The expert committee on the effect of Government Regulation Flour upon the health of the community issued an interim report on July 3, in which it was stated that the bread made from this flour when properly baked was perfectly wholesome. But the public remained hard to convince that in some cases serious indigestion was not caused in delicate persons by war bread. The food situation was, however, relieved by the new crop of potatoes, and on July 3 the potatoless days in hotels, restaurants and clubs were abolished. For the remainder of the year the restrictions applied to public meals concerned only the quantities of meat, bread and sugar which could be consumed, and a limitation of the prices which could be charged for meals to officers and men in uniform.

On the 5th, a statement was made in the House of Commons with regard to brewing. The Government had decided to permit the brewing of one-third more beer during the quarter ending on September 30. Mr. Bonar Law explained that there was always a greater consumption of beer in the summer months, and that there were difficulties caused by the present deficiency in some of the large centres of population and for harvest purposes. There was to be a reduction in the specific gravity of a considerable proportion of the amount of beer brewed. Mr. Leif Jones moved the adjournment of the House in order to protest, but after a somewhat hilarious debate, the Government carried their point by 130 votes to 44. On July 9 the considered opinion of the Minister of Food with regard to the criticism of war bread was given to the Press at a Conference at Grosvenor House. It was admitted that certain millers had not yet succeeded in adapting their machinery to the existing Orders and that in a few districts badly made flour had been used. On the other hand, most of the millers had produced good and wholesome flour from the mixed grains. A statement was made as to the two essential points on which the policy of the Food Controller was based. The first was that an unrestricted supply of bread must be maintained at all costs, and the second that with an increasing dearth of ships the available supplies of wheat for Europe was definitely limited in volume. These two conflicting points could be reconciled only by great economy in the use of wheat or by the use of mixtures or both. It was not possible to educate the populace to the use of cereal food in some other form than bread since bread is the prime food-stuff of the working man and the poorer the family the greater the consumption of bread. Lord Rhondda announced in the House of Lords on July 11 that he intended to fix meat prices and explained that he hoped to be able to stop excessive profits all round. The

prices would be fixed in consultation with the Board of Agriculture though not necessarily in agreement with them. He refused to admit the argument that, since store cattle had been bought in many instances at high prices, therefore the consumer must continue to pay at an excessive rate. The definite arrangements to this end were announced on July 20, when a list of maximum prices for live cattle for military and civilian consumption, which represented a great reduction on those prevailing, was fixed by the Food Controller. It was also decided to reduce the price of flour so as to enable bread to be sold at 9d per quarter loaf as compared with the actual price of 1s. At the same time Lord Rhondda was stated to be engaged in working out the details of a scheme for the better distribution of sugar, the administration of which was to be one of the duties of food committees which were to be established by Local Authorities. The public was informed a little later that the reduction of the price of bread would involve a heavy charge on the Exchequer, but the reduction of the price of meat, which was expected to amount from September 1 on an average to 3d in the lb and from January 1 to 6d. in the lb., would merely mean the cutting off of unjustified profits. The House of Commons debated the problem on July 25, when it was announced by Mr. Clynes that all the flour mills of any importance were to be taken over and the bakers would only be allowed to charge more than 9d for the quarter loaf in cases where they delivered bread or gave credit or where they could prove to the satisfaction of the Ministry that they had specially high working costs. Mr. Clynes also announced that schemes for securing tea at reasonable prices through control by the department were being worked out. Lord Rhondda made a full statement of his policy in the House of Lords on the following afternoon, July 26. While refusing to take too gloomy a view of the situation (since prices were not so high in this country as in others) he emphasised the need of economy. His policy was to fix the prices of those articles of prime necessity of which he could obtain effective control, at all stages from the producer down to the retailer, on the principle of allowing a reasonable pre-war profit for those connected with the production and distribution of each particular commodity. In fact, the policy would be one of determining profits at every stage. Existing agencies, with the elimination of unnecessary middlemen, would be used for the purposes of distribution under licence and control and under the supervision of Local Food Controllers to be appointed by the Local Authorities. He accepted the fullest responsibility for the policy of subsidising the loaf. With regard to meat, the problem was to secure a general reduction without inflicting loss on the farmers who had bought store cattle in the expectation of high prices in the autumn. For this reason a sliding scale had been fixed: 74s. per live cwt for September, 72s. for October, 67s. for November and December, and 60s. for January, which would

enable the farmer to realise during the earlier months without any serious loss, while at the same time there would be an immediate and an increasing reduction to the consumer. All wholesale and retail dealers were to be registered, and if they failed to observe the conditions they would be struck off the register. The fixing of the retail prices for different joints after the limits of profit had been determined would be left to the Local Food Committees. Towards the end of July the prospects with regard to food greatly improved. The Director-General of Food Production stated that the increased area in England and Wales of corn and potatoes for the harvest amounted to no less than 347,000 acres, results which exceeded all expectations and indicated the value of the assistance given by the War Office by the loan of soldiers for work on the land. This was irrespective of the still greater relative increase achieved by the small grower. For tobacco, too, new maximum prices were fixed by the Board of Trade during the month which had the effect of reducing the prices of the cheaper brands by 1*d.* an oz. and of the popular packet of cigarettes from 5*d* to 4*1/2d.*

In the beginning of July an important scheme with regard to the distribution of coal was announced to come into operation on September 10, whereby it was estimated that 700,000,000 ton-miles annually would be saved in railway transport of coal. The scheme, for the purposes of which Great Britain was divided into twenty areas, was based on the following main principles. First, that the consumer should take deliveries as near the producing point as possible, that the movement of coal should, as far as possible, be in well-defined tracks, and in view of the superior facilities afforded by the main trunk lines should follow those roads wherever possible. Arrangements were also made whereby supplies of coal of a special type required by steam raisers would not be supplied to ordinary customers.

The most interesting events in the House of Commons during July were concerned with the Irish Convention and the Stockholm Conference. These topics are dealt with elsewhere, but of routine matters we must observe first the proceedings dealing with the financial position of the country. The committee stage of the Finance Bill began on July 2, and in the course of the sitting, Mr. Bonar Law made substantial concessions on the entertainments and the tobacco duties. It was announced that fourpenny tickets would bear 1*d.* tax, and that the 2*d.* tax would begin with fivepenny tickets. He proposed too that the addition of 1*s.* to the tax on tickets between 7*s.* 6*d.* and 15*s.* should be commuted to 6*d.* As for tobacco, the Bill had proposed to double the duty, but Mr. Bonar Law said that he had come to the conclusion that the only way of keeping down the price of the cheaper kinds of tobacco was to lower the duty, so he proposed that from July 16 the additional duty should only be 50 per cent. Mr. Wardle, the Acting Chairman

of the Labour Party, welcomed the concession, and suggested that the very high price of tobacco had had not a little to do with the recent industrial unrest. The report stage of the Bill was taken on July 16 when there were technical discussions on depreciation allowance and valuation of stocks under the Excess Profits Duty. There was some criticism of the proposal of the Government, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer met his critics by slightly modifying the original plan. When the third reading of the Bill was reached on the following day, Mr. Bonar Law made an interesting statement on the general financial position of the country. He warned the House that the country could not go on spending money at the rate at which it was being spent on the war without serious disadvantage, and this disadvantage would be realised more completely when the war came to an end. The country was living in a false atmosphere so long as the Government were raising, by loan, money intended for the war. In the meantime, he insisted, the Government had to try and finance the war in such a way as would do least harm to the nation when the war was finished. He would have liked to have raised much more of the expenditure out of revenue, but in his belief nothing could be worse than to lay taxation on such an overwhelming basis that every means of carrying on the war would be taken away. So far, the credit of the country had been wonderfully maintained, a fact which was largely due to the willingness of all classes to submit to taxation and the readiness with which they had lent money to the nation. Dealing with the question of a new loan, Mr. Bonar Law declined to commit himself as to what he proposed to do in the future by way of raising the necessary money. The Vote of Credit was taken on July 24. It was for 650,000,000*l.*, the largest sum ever asked at a single sitting by any statesman in the financial history of Great Britain. It brought the amount voted for 1917-18 to 1,500,000,000*l.* and the aggregate for the whole war to 5,292,000,000*l.* Mr. Bonar Law, in moving the Vote of Credit, went into considerable detail with regard to the expenditure incurred under the last two Votes of Credit covering the first 112 days of the financial year, and with regard to the more distinctive items which made up the huge excess of expenditure over the Budget estimate. He explained that our advances to the Allies had steadily increased in spite of the entry of the United States into the war, but he believed that substantial help would shortly be forthcoming from the United States, sufficient to pay for supplies of all kinds required from that country. He explained that the excess on account of munitions represented an actual increase in the volume of munitions available, and part of the increase on the Army had gone in greater payments to India for war services. The output of aeroplanes had increased more rapidly than had been expected, and involved increased expenditure. He concluded by insisting again that although this country

could not continue to spend money indefinitely at the present rate, it could continue longer than its enemies. Mr. McKenna, in carrying on the debate, declared that we had to look forward to a total expenditure of upwards of 8,000,000*l.* a day, and he warned the House that there was a limit beyond which we could not go without forcing prices up to a point which would cause intolerable unrest. He pointed out that our present scale of loans represented a permanent income tax of 3*s.* 4*d.* in the pound. The main cause of the rise in prices in his view was not profiteering but the inflation due to the high expenditure, and from this point of view he criticised the proposal of the Government to sell the four-pound loaf with a national subsidy at 9*d.* The absence of unemployment, and the consequent improved distribution of money among the working classes, caused comparatively little attention to be paid to these amazing figures among the general public. But the House of Commons had already taken the alarm, and at the beginning of the month had asserted the traditional right of the House to control national expenditure by a motion calling for the appointment of a committee of the House of Commons with the power to review all national expenditure, examine ministers and officials and report to the House. Mr. Godfrey Collins in introducing the motion charged the Government and the Treasury with not taking sufficient steps to control expenditure or to institute business accounts, and declared that the House of Commons could not exercise any control because the necessary knowledge was departmentally withheld. The seconder of the motion attributed the growth of uncontrolled expenditure to the increasing omnipotence of the executive over Parliament, and the growing independence of the administrative departments. Mr. Wardle, speaking for the Labour Party, supported the proposal, and Mr. Bonar Law, winding up the debate, met the dissatisfaction by proposing to appoint a select committee at once to consider how additional control of expenditure could be obtained, and to go to the departments to examine the methods of expenditure and make recommendations thereon.

The Corn Production Bill entered on its committee stage during July, when both in Parliament and in a certain section of the Press considerable opposition was expressed to the principle of the Bill. The President of the Board of Agriculture agreed on July 11 to introduce a change in the method of calculating payments to the farmer so as to put the small man more on an equality with the big producer. The debate on a clause establishing minimum agricultural wages, which was one of the most startling innovations introduced by the Bill, took place on July 19. Several difficult questions arose as to whether the minimum rate fixed by the Board should be in cash or partly in kind. Mr. Prothero, while sympathising with the desire that agricultural labourers should be paid more commonly in cash, declared that it was impossible to introduce so great a change

all at once, and appealed to the House to leave the matter to be dealt with by the Wages Board. In order that the Board should have adequate power, the Government proposed to accept an amendment enabling it to limit or prohibit the reckoning of benefits or additions in lieu of payment of wages in cash. The Labour Party, a little later, moved an amendment substituting 30s for 25s. as the minimum weekly rate of wages. The Government took the view that the amendment would upset the balance of their Bill and would defeat its main object by discouraging farmers. It was therefore decided to regard the 25s minimum wage as fundamental, and the Government issued an urgent Whip on the subject. The matter came up for decision on July 23, when Mr Prothero announced that the Government could not accept the amendment and were prepared to stand or fall by the results. He assured the House that in many low paid districts agricultural labourers desired the passage of the Bill, and would not thank well-wishers for sacrificing them to some impracticable ideal. Mr. Prothero declared that the late Government had made two miscalculations, the submarine menace and the possibility of a great deficiency in the world's supply of grain. "We cannot afford," he said solemnly, "to make a third miscalculation. We have got to grow all the food possible in this country." This speech had a great effect upon the House, and after some debate, Mr. J. H. Thomas explained that the Labour Party had not moved their amendment in a spirit of hostility to the Government. It was a genuine attempt to raise the wages of the poor and down-trodden in the country. It was then felt that the result of the debate was a foregone conclusion, and there was little surprise when the amendment was rejected by 301 votes to 102. Actually a larger number of Liberals voted with the Government than against them, 89 to 80.

Towards the middle of July Mr. Lloyd George made his first reconstruction of his Cabinet since the time that he took office. Sir Edward Carson retired from the Admiralty, where his place was taken by Sir Eric Geddes (who had previously been appointed Admiralty Controller), and became a member of the War Cabinet without portfolio. Mr. Churchill, whom it was declared Mr. Lloyd George had long wished to recall to office, became Minister of Munitions, Mr. E. S. Montagu became Secretary-of-State for India, and Dr. Addison, in leaving the Ministry of Munitions, became Minister in Charge of Reconstruction without portfolio. The War Cabinet consisted, until the crisis caused by the Stockholm Conference, of Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Milner, Lord Curzon, Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Bonar Law, who was not expected to attend regularly, Mr. Barnes in place of Mr. Henderson absent in Petrograd, and General Smuts. Some dissatisfaction was caused by Mr. Churchill's appointment, and a question on the subject was asked in the House of Commons. A seat was found for Sir Eric Geddes in the constituency of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities. The second reading

of a Bill to provide for the necessary changes was introduced on July 27. Its main object was to establish a Ministry of Reconstruction, while a subsidiary aim was to regularise the position of two members of the War Cabinet without portfolio, Sir Edward Carson and Mr. Henderson. Sir George Cave, in moving the second reading, indicated the field to be covered by the Ministry of Reconstruction. Its first business would be the restoration of normal conditions in commerce and in industry and the development of trade. The second function would be the restoration of the normal life of persons affected by war conditions and the carrying out of improvements in their condition suggested by war experience. The new department would be advisory and not executive. Mr. Herbert Samuel made a bitter attack on the Bill and on the Government which, however, did not prevent the Bill from getting on to the statute book. He declared that the new ministry would be "not a ministry of reconstruction but a ministry for over-lapping". He calculated that when the new places were filled the members of the House who were also members of the Government would be no fewer than 60. There were also in the Government 28 persons who had not seats in either House, making a total of 88.

Turning to questions directly connected with the administration of the war, we may mention first the committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Military Service (Review of Exceptions) Act, 1917. The Director of Recruiting, Brigadier-General Campbell Geddes, was the first witness. He insisted that the work of discriminating between the men who were to be taken should never have been put upon the recruiting machine under the War Office. He pointed out the difficulties in keeping the military register up to date. Under the Derby scheme, men attested in London were registered as far away as Aberdeen or Inverness. Some men attested in six or seven different places and got 2s. 9d. on each occasion. Moreover, they had found that in 1915 Medical Cards were forged and that there was a regular industry of printing false classification cards. The Adjutant-General at the end of 1915 had formed and still held the opinion that it was eminently desirable that the machine should be in two parts, a part for receiving under the War Office and a part for discriminating work under civilian control. The War Office proposed in the future to form a separate special department to do the discriminating work whose areas under deputy directors would correspond with the employment bureau areas. He then went on to describe the arrangements for the Local Medical Boards and the inspection of their arrangements by Col. Galloway who advised the doctors as to the standards of fitness. A good deal of fraud was prevalent. There was a certain amount of "doping," and as for the certificates of private practitioners, they were of the greatest use in many cases, but unfortunately, there was no proof that the man to whom the private certificate referred was the man

before the Board. He went on to emphasise the need of men of low categories, and declared, "There is no man who is able to make his living in civil life who cannot find some employment in the Army." Lord Derby, in giving evidence on July 24, foreshadowed a sweeping reform of recruiting and the transfer of control of the whole system of obtaining men for the forces from the Army to a civilian department. He attended in response to a resolution sent to the Prime Minister by the committee urging that a change of system should be made at once, and recommending that the whole organisation of recruiting, of medical boards and of the medical examinations and re-examinations should be transferred to the Local Government Board.

Lord Derby said he accepted this resolution absolutely, but that he wanted the committee to go very much further and to adopt a scheme whereby a civilian body would find the men and only after that would the Army come in.

During July the submarine menace, while still threatening, did not increase. Taking vessels of 1,600 tons and over, for the week ending July 1, fifteen were sunk; for the week ending July 8, 13; for the week ending July 15, 13; and for the week ending July 22, 19. The alarm felt by the public at the end of June subsided, especially as there was in the food situation also the improvement which we have already described.

We have already alluded to the conference with regard to the treatment of prisoners of war, to which Lord Newton had been the leading British delegate. Lord Newton stated in the House of Lords on July 25 that the agreement they signed on July 2 had not yet been ratified by the German Government. Two days later it was announced in the House of Commons that both Governments had ratified the convention, and the following summary of the chief provisions was given. That all existing agreements for direct repatriation should be resumed, that the medical qualifications for repatriation and internment in a neutral country should be made more lenient, that all officers and N.C.O.'s who have been in captivity for eighteen months should be interned in a neutral country, and that all reprisals against individuals should be at once cancelled. The Dutch Government had a special share in bringing the convention about, and declared itself ready to receive in Holland a maximum of 16,000 prisoners of war, combatant or civilian.

The commission of inquiry into industrial unrest which had been appointed on June 12, finished its task on July 17, and about a week later the summary prepared by Mr. G. N. Barnes of the reports of the eight local commissions was issued. Among the chief causes of unrest were high food prices in relation to wages and unequal distribution of food; restriction of personal freedom and, in particular, the effects of the Munitions of War Acts; delay in settlement of disputes and lack of confidence in the pledges of the Government to labour; bad housing, restriction of liquor, industrial fatigue, and also lack of

proper organisation among the Trade Unions themselves. The chief reforms recommended by the Commissioners were as follows. (1) An immediate reduction in price of food through Government subsidies, if necessary, and a better system of distribution. (2) The adoption of the principle of the Whitley Report, namely, some form of internal government through industrial councils for each trade. (3) The raising of agricultural wages in the western area and the cessation of employment of coloured labour at the ports. In addition, there were a number of semi-technical grievances of labour, such as the failure to give a bonus to men working on day rates and the need of greater publicity with regard to the abolition of leaving certificates. The extent of the labour unrest had been evidenced a few days earlier at a meeting at Woolwich. Dr. Addison had asked Sir William Robertson, the Chief of the War Staff, to address a meeting of munition workers there. He had intended to express to the meeting the thanks of the Army for their work, and to impress upon them the necessity for continuing a maximum output of munitions. His notes had been given in advance to a news agency. He was, however, so persistently interrupted that the speech was not delivered, and accordingly he asked the Press Bureau to refrain from publishing it. This had been done, but exaggerated rumours of the disturbance had got abroad, and it therefore became necessary to explain the occurrence in the House of Commons.

Some interesting discussions on peace took place in the course of the month. The new German Imperial Chancellor, Dr. Michaelis, had delivered his first speech in the Reichstag. The Prime Minister, speaking two days later at the meeting in celebration of the Belgian Independence Day, said that the Military party in Germany had won. In answer to the boasts about the submarines, he gave an encouraging account of the position of this country with regard to shipping and food supplies. There was no hope, he said, for Belgium in the German Chancellor's speech, but the determination of the Allies was that the deliverance of Belgium and her restoration as a free and independent people must be complete. He went on to say that it was entirely the business of the German people themselves what manner of Government they chose to rule over them, but what manner of Government we could trust to make peace with was our business, and we could only make peace with a free Germany.

There was a full dress debate on peace in the House of Commons on July 26, the occasion being the Consolidated Fund Bill to provide the sinews of war for the next three months. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald recited a part of the Reichstag resolution and called upon the Government in conjunction with their Allies to restate their peace terms accordingly. He held that the resolutions passed by the Reichstag by an overwhelming majority must be taken to indicate the opinion of

the people, and he appealed for a reciprocal declaration from the British House of Commons. He was followed by another eminent pacifist, Mr. Trevelyan. Both were heard by the House courteously but coldly. Mr. Asquith declared that his interpretation of recent events in Germany was that the counsels of the moderates had given way to the counsels of the extremists. Peace, he said, was the supreme interest of mankind, but subject to the all-important condition that it did not defeat the purposes for which the free nations entered upon the war—freedom, and nothing short of freedom. It followed, he declared, that no peace would be worth having which restored the *status quo* and left countries like Belgium, Serbia and Greece under the constant menace of military coercion. He submitted that in any rearrangement of the map, the governing principle ought to be the will of the populations affected. In the meantime, we should not be helping the advent of peace if we were to give the impression that there was any faltering in our determination to carry the burden which we had taken up with a clear conscience for great ends. Mr. Bonar Law, speaking for the Government, declared that Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and his friends had no conception of the real issue which was being fought out. Germany had never put down her peace aims because she did not mean what Mr. Macdonald and his friends said she meant. He maintained that we should have lost the war if we had not security that the same danger which had ruined this generation might not ruin our children. The amendment was rejected by 148 votes to 19.

Before dealing with the Stockholm Conference, it will be convenient to mention certain proceedings in Parliament prior to the adjournment in August. The Corn Production Bill passed through its report stage and its third reading in the House of Commons towards the beginning of the month. Mr. Prothero announced on the 6th the concession of a minimum wage clause proposing that the Wages Board should, as far as possible, secure to able-bodied men wages which are adequate to promote efficiency and to enable an ordinary man to maintain himself and his family in reasonable comfort. When it came up for its second reading in the House of Lords, the most noteworthy speech came from Lord Lincolnshire, a former president of the Board of Agriculture in a Liberal Government. He declared that no critic of the Bill had been able to suggest a better method by which an early increase in the food supply could be obtained, and emphatically repudiated the attack on the Bill on the ground that it was opposed to the principles of free trade. The Bill was returned to the House of Commons on August 20 for consideration of certain amendments and the Royal assent was given on the 22nd. It was by far and away the most important business to which Parliament had put its hand in the first part of the session of 1917.

Mr. Fisher, the President of the Board of Education, fol-

lowing up his important speech in May, introduced the Education Bill in the House of Commons about a fortnight before the recess. Mr. Fisher at the outset insisted that though the Bill would not enable us to beat the Germans in 1918, yet it was prompted by deficiencies revealed by the war. Going into details, he explained that the Bill imposed a duty upon the council of every county and county borough to submit schemes to the Board of Education providing for the comprehensive organisation of education in their areas, and in order that this function might be discharged, it was proposed to remove the limit of the 2d. rate which might be raised for higher education. He then described a series of proposals designed to secure to every child a sound physique and a solid groundwork of knowledge before the period when the part-time system began. These proposals were the establishment of nursery schools for children under five, the amending of the law of school attendance so as to abolish all exemptions between the ages of five to fourteen, and the placing of further restrictions upon the employment of children during the elementary school period. It was proposed that no child under twelve should be employed for profit. He then turned to the continued education of young persons up to eighteen. Every young person who had not received a full-time education up to the age of sixteen was to receive a part-time education up to the age of eighteen, during the day and in the employer's time. He also proposed to take means for the improvement of physical training. The Local Education Authority, for example, was to be empowered to maintain playing fields, school baths, and game centres. Unfortunately, very few members of the House of Commons were present to listen to this speech, and there were already rumours that the Government would be unable to find time to proceed with the Bill during the session.

The subject, however, which created by far the greatest excitement during the month of August was the question of the participation of members of the English Socialist and Labour Parties in the Conference at Stockholm which had been summoned to meet by the International Socialist Bureau. Delegates could only attend with the concurrence of the British Government since they could not leave the country without passports. There was at the same time an invitation from the Russian Government to representatives of the minority as well as the majority of the Labour Party to visit Petrograd, and in the invitation the Independent Labour Party was expressly mentioned. The question of passports was raised in the House of Commons on June 8 when Lord Robert Cecil stated that passports for Russia would be issued to Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. Jowett, but they were not intended to enable the holders to communicate directly or indirectly with enemy subjects at Stockholm or elsewhere, and passports would only be

issued on this express understanding. It soon appeared, however, that Parliament was not the only body which had to be consulted in this question. It was announced that the Sailors' and Firemen's Union, whose protest at the Leeds Conference will be remembered, refused to permit the two delegates, Mr. Jowett and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, to sail from Great Britain. The ship which was to convey the delegates left an east coast port on June 11, but as Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Jowett were refused admission to it, the other delegates of the Labour Party, Mr. G. H. Roberts, M.P., and Mr. W. Carter, also remained behind. Meanwhile, it had become known that Mr. Henderson, the Secretary of the Labour Party, who had recently returned from a visit to Petrograd, was in favour of the Stockholm Conference being held. He had subsequently, in his capacity as Secretary of the Labour Party, visited Paris to discuss the situation with the representatives of the French and Russian Labour Parties, and there was some dissatisfaction expressed in the House of Commons on July 30 when it became known that Mr. Macdonald had accompanied him on his visit to Paris. Questions were put as to whether Mr. Henderson was visiting Paris on behalf of the Government and whether Mr. Macdonald's visit had had the sanction of the Government. Mr. Bonar Law explained that the arrangements for the visit had been settled without the knowledge of the Government, the representatives having been selected by the executive of the Labour Party and Mr. Henderson attending in his capacity as Secretary of the Labour Party. The only way in which the Government could have interposed would have been to refuse passports.

Two important developments occurred on August 7 when the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress decided that it would send representatives to Stockholm provided that the Labour Party Conference and the Trades Union Congress were in favour of that course. This decision conditionally committed the oldest and largest body of organised workers in this country to participation. The second development was the determination of the executive of the Miners' Federation to postpone their decision. They decided to ask the Labour Party for more information. The Conference finally met on August 10, when Mr. Henderson insisted that the alteration in his attitude towards the holding of an International Conference had occurred by reason of his visit to Russia. He found the most confused ideas current in Russia as to the aims for which this country continued the struggle, and deliberate perversions of our object were being utilised to the full by enemy agents. The provisional Government was at that time in favour of a Conference, and several of its members had pressed Mr. Henderson more than once to use his influence with British Labour to secure their attendance at the Conference. Since, then, he believed that the Conference

had become inevitable, he held that it was dangerous for the Russian representatives to meet representatives from enemy and neutral countries alone. He therefore decided that he ought to urge British Labour to attend the Conference, but a Conference that should be solely consultative, and consequently he made it a fundamental condition that the Conference should be a free exchange of opinions and not in any sense obligatory. He also urged that the case of the whole Allies was so strong that if it were presented by responsible working-class representatives it would materially assist in convincing the German people that it was the crime of their rulers which had caused the war and now prevents its just settlement. That was why he was in favour of a consultative conference with proper safeguards and conditions. A resolution in favour of representation of Britain at the International Conference was subsequently moved and seconded. It was opposed by Mr. Barnes, the Minister of Pensions, who urged that the Conference would retard the realisations of the ideals with which this nation had entered the war. It had been turned down by the American Federation of Labour, by the Belgian Socialists, by the French and by the Italians, and he denied that the opinion of the present Russian Government was in favour of the Conference. Among the delegates who spoke in favour of the Conference were Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. J. H. Thomas; while it was opposed by Mr. G. Roberts, the Secretary of the Board of Trade. The vote was then taken, and the amendment for the adjournment of the Conference was rejected by 1,651,000 to 391,000 votes.

On the following day considerable astonishment was caused by the publication of a correspondence between Mr. Henderson and Mr. Lloyd George in which the former tendered his resignation from the Cabinet on the ground that he had gathered the impression that the Prime Minister was of the opinion that that position was not compatible with the post of Secretary to the Labour Party. Mr. Lloyd George's letter stated that Mr. Henderson's attitude at the Labour Conference had taken the Cabinet completely by surprise. He declared that Mr. Henderson had known that his colleagues were unanimously opposed to the Stockholm Conference, and the Prime Minister had been under the impression that Mr. Henderson would use his influence against meeting any of the representatives at that time. He urged that when Mr. Henderson spoke at the Conference he was not merely a member of the Labour Party but a member of the Cabinet and responsible for the war, and the delegates were accordingly justified in assuming that the advice given by Mr. Henderson was not inconsistent with the opinions of the Cabinet. Mr. Lloyd George went on to declare that he had on the previous day received an important communication from the Russian Government stating that while they did not deem it possible to prevent Russian delegates from taking part in the

Stockholm Conference, they regarded it as a party concern and its decision in no wise binding on the liberty of action of the Government. This news had immediately been communicated to Mr Henderson, and yet he had left the Conference in ignorance of this vital fact which must necessarily have affected their judgment.

When Parliament met on the following Monday, Mr. Bonar Law stated that the Government had decided that permission to attend the Conference would not be granted, and that the same decision had been taken by the Governments of the United States, France, and Italy. Mr. Henderson then rose to make a personal explanation. He declared that his visit to Paris with Mr Ramsay Macdonald had been the subject of consideration at a special meeting of the War Cabinet twenty-four hours before he left. He also denied emphatically that he had ever hinted to any of his colleagues that he was going to do other than continue the course to which he had committed himself, and that no request had been made to him that he should state the position of the Government at the Labour Party Conference, and that had such a request been made he would have handed in his resignation to the Government; he insisted that the last intention he had was to withhold from the Labour Conference any information which he was legally entitled to use. His speech was very coldly received by the House of Commons, and Mr. Lloyd George, in replying, merely repeated the statements he had already made in his letter insisting finally that nothing could be more fatal than to hold Conferences with the enemy at the very moment when the first step in the restoration of discipline was to prevent fraternisation with the enemy on the Russian Front. It was announced the same evening that Mr. George Barnes had taken Mr. Henderson's place as a member of the War Cabinet.

On Tuesday, August 14, the Executive of the Labour Party met in London and passed a vote of confidence in Mr. Henderson, and a resolution reiterating the opinion that the British Labour Party ought to be represented at Stockholm. They appointed eight delegates, and decided that a representation should be made to the Government on the subject of passports. The Miners' Federation held another meeting on August 20, and reversed their previous vote in favour of the Conference. It was stated that their decision was determined by the fact that the Conference was really nothing more than a revival of the Socialist International constituted on the old lines and governed by the old rules and regulations, in which the Socialist Societies whose delegates would be overwhelmingly pacifist would be entitled to participate. The adjourned Conference of the Labour Party met on the 21st, when it reaffirmed by a very small majority (3,000 on a total vote of 2,465,000) its decision to accept the invitation to an International Socialist Congress at Stockholm. The Conference also insisted that only the

twenty-four delegates nominated by the Trade Union Section should be permitted to take part, and that these would all be bound not to express any view or advocate any policy other than that of the majority. A proposal by the British Socialist Party that the Labour Members should be withdrawn from the Government met with no success. Mr Smillie stated that the miners' vote would automatically go against it, and it was opposed both by Mr. Barnes and by Mr. Henderson himself.

The Select Committee on army medical examinations presented a special report at the beginning of August. It recommended that the business of medical examination for the army should be transferred from the War Office to a civil authority, and that any man receiving a notice calling him to the Colours should have the right to go before an Appeal Tribunal and ask for a fresh medical examination. It had become clear to the Committee, the report said, that the policy which had been followed was open to grave objections. It was, for instance, undesirable to have a military medical officer as President of each Board and to give to the President over-riding power over his colleagues. The guiding rule: "There is no man who is able to make his living in ordinary civil life, who cannot be employed in the army somewhere," was followed with much too blind an obedience, whilst the policy of classifying men, not as they were at the time of examination, but as they probably would be after four months' training, was described by a medical witness as foolishness. It was understood that the Government was making arrangements to transfer recruiting to a civil department.

On August 9 Mr. Macpherson, the Under-Secretary for War, gave evidence before the Select Committee with regard to the secret instructions issued as to the rejection of recruits. Mr. Macpherson had denied in the House that any such secret instructions had been issued, but now admitted that since the Committee began its sittings he had seen the confidential letter sent out by General Sir Alfred Keogh. The witness admitted that had he known the document existed he would not have given to the House of Commons the answer which he did. He did not agree that he had been misled, as the army distinguished between "secret" and "confidential."

Turning to questions more immediately connected with the war, we may note first Lord Newton's speech giving particulars of the agreement reached at the Hague as to the treatment of prisoners. He explained that all existing agreements relating to the exchange of civilians over 45 years of age, of invalid civilians, and of totally incapacitated combatants, were to be resumed as quickly as possible. All captures should be notified with the least possible delay, and the prisoners should be provided with the means of at once communicating with their relatives. The Netherlands Government had offered to put 16,000 places at the disposal of the two Governments for the intern-

ment of prisoners in Holland, and he would do everything he could to expedite the arrangements. The Germans had brought forward an objection to the use of Hull as the port of embarkation, and Lord Newton supposed that the explanation was that the German Government desired to maintain the belief in Germany that Southwold was the only route open between this country and the Continent.

The food situation slightly improved during August. It was announced at the beginning of the month that the municipal authorities were to take the place of the War Savings Committees for the propaganda work in relation to food economy. The details of the sugar control scheme were issued on August 5. The main points were as follows. The local authorities were to be entrusted with duties in connexion with distribution and prices of essential food-stuffs and with the maintenance of economy of consumption on the basis of three principles. first, that supplies must be conserved, and secondly, must be shared equally by rich and poor; thirdly, prices must be kept down. Sugar cards were to be issued in October, but the scheme would not become effective until the end of the year. The main features of the sugar distribution scheme were that all retailers were to be registered by a local Food Control Committee; that sugar registration cards would be issued to every household and a portion of each would be deposited with the registered retailer selected, who would be required to give preference to registered customers. There were also arrangements for dealing with caterers, institutions, and manufacturers, and registered retailers were to have their supplies of sugar regulated in accordance with the number of their registered customers, and the caterers, institutions, or manufacturers were authorised to buy from them, while in the same way supplies to wholesalers would be regulated in accordance with the quantities which registered retailers, etc., were authorised to obtain from them.

During August the local authorities proceeded to the appointment of the local Food Committees, and throughout the country labour pressed for a larger representation on the Committees which, it was believed, tended to fall under the control of interested tradesmen. The Food Controller continued his policy of fixing prices, articles affected being, for instance, jam and various varieties of grain such as wheat, barley, and oats. It was reported towards the end of the month that there was likely to be a shortage of tea, and an Order providing for a census of tea stores was issued on August 21. By the end of the month maximum retail prices had been fixed for jam, "Government" cheese, milk, lentils, maize flour, oatmeal, rolled and flaked oats, peas, haricot and butter beans, certain grades of tea and chocolates and other sweetmeats. Maximum retail rates had also been put into force for Irish butter, and the farmers' price for home-grown wheat, rye, oats, and barley had also been regulated. Maximum wholesale prices for meat were

to come into operation shortly, but fixed retail prices for bread and meat had not yet been arranged. A Royal Proclamation on August 30 prohibited the importation of bacon, butter, hams, and lard, except under Government licence. Maximum importers' prices for these articles were fixed, and fixed retail prices soon followed.

Slightly before the adjournment Mr. Lloyd George made an important speech in answer to one from Mr. Kennedy Jones. The latter asked the Government to answer two specific questions; first, did they believe that the passive pressure the Fleet as then exercised was the best help it could give, and was not some change in the present scheme of naval operations desirable; and, secondly, were they taking every measure that foresight could devise to inform the people as to what may be required of them in nerve and endurance by reason of the loss in merchant ships. Mr. Lloyd George began by giving some reassuring figures of our stocks of food, which had considerably improved during the last month. The harvest of this country promised to be good, and if it were, we should be in a better position than for a good many years. At the same time, the harvests of the world were not good, and the claims of our Allies enforced the need for even stricter economy than before. Dealing with the shipping position, Mr. Lloyd George declared that April had been the worst month, when we lost 550,000 tons gross, but that since then there had been a great improvement. He also announced that the increase in tonnage was considerable, and very nearly as great as the tonnage built during peace time. He also congratulated the Shipping Controller on his feat in carrying more tons with diminished tonnage. At the same time, he did not deny that there was a very considerable deficiency, which he hoped would be made good by the efforts of our own workmen and those of the United States. Turning to the military situation, Mr. Lloyd George said that in view of the Russian collapse, the brunt of the fighting must fall for the time being upon other countries, notably upon England, but he declared that whereas our difficulties would diminish and our power would increase, the difficulties of the enemy would increase and his power diminish.

The union of the country during August was menaced by a threatened railway strike. The Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, a sectional body which had not taken part in the amalgamation which resulted in the National Union of Railwaymen, was demanding the recognition of the principle of an eight hours day. On the 17th a Conference of delegates resolved to call on the members to cease work, but later in the evening it was stated by the Secretary of the Society that the President of the Board of Trade had made a certain suggestion to him which was to be brought before the Conference of delegates the following day. The National Union of Railwaymen were protesting strongly against the threatened

strike. The Secretary of the Society concerned in the proposed strike declared that his men were weary with overwork. Again and again they had to work eighteen hours a day on the footplate, and for days together work would range from twelve to fifteen hours. It was not asked that there should be rigid observance of the eight hours day at once, but they did desire that the shifts should be arranged as far as possible on an eight hour basis. The Government then issued a Proclamation forbidding the strike; and negotiations, the course of which it is not necessary to follow, continued between the Board of Trade and the men. Finally, an understanding was reached and the proposed strike was abandoned on the reception of a letter from Sir Albert Stanley, confirming what he had already stated to the Executive Committee of the Union, to their delegates, and also in the House of Commons, *viz.*, that he pledged the Government, the War Cabinet, and himself personally, to continue the present control of the railways for a time after the cessation of hostilities, so that there would be an opportunity afforded to bring forward a request for a shorter working day while the railways were under control, and that such a request would have the immediate and sympathetic consideration of the Government. Sir Albert Stanley also undertook to use his good offices with the Railway Executive Committee to secure that they would reduce the long hours to the lowest possible minimum, and would see the men's representatives and discuss outstanding matters at the earliest possible moment.

One interesting, if minor, event which occurred during August, was the decision of the House of Commons, with practically no debate, to remove the grille which had hitherto sheltered members from the supposedly distracting influence of the ladies attending to hear the debates in the gallery set apart for them.

At the beginning of September it was stated that before the end of the year maximum retail prices would probably be in operation for all the principal articles of food with the exception of fish, potatoes, and other vegetables. The decrease in prices, however, it was thought, would be likely to lead to an increase in consumption, and, therefore, side by side with the elaborate food orders regulating importation and maximum wholesale and retail prices, there was set on foot a vigorous economy campaign. On September 8 it was announced that the Food Controller had fixed maximum wholesale prices for milk which would involve a retail price of 7d. a quart in London in October, and 8d. a quart for the rest of the winter; and at the same time the Controller of Coal Mines issued an Order specifying the maximum charges which wholesale coal merchants and coal factors should in future be entitled to make. The policy of maximum prices was not, however, received without considerable opposition from some quarters. At a meeting of the Central Associated Chambers of Commerce on September 6, several speakers complained that

the production of food would be seriously discouraged by Lord Rhondda's policy, and a resolution was adopted forecasting a beef famine next spring and a substantial reduction in the crops of 1918, particularly in the case of wheat and potatoes. On the same day a deputation from the Central Chamber of Agriculture waited upon Lord Rhondda in order to protest against his policy in view of the sacrifices which it called for from the farmers. In answering the deputation, Lord Rhondda said that some farmers did not realise the paramount necessity of making sacrifices which would never be asked for in time of peace. He told them that, with Mr Prothero, he regarded prime beef as no longer economical for the country at large, and urged them to kill off cattle at an earlier stage of fattening this winter than had been practised heretofore. He went on to say that the abnormal rise in prices was owing to the fact that the overseas supplies had been diverted to the use of the Allied armies and navies. This had caused a scarcity, and the absence of the usual competition had, without any effort on the part of the British agriculturist, caused the increase in prices in this country. Control of the potato trade was introduced by the Potatoes Order (1917), which was signed by Lord Rhondda on September 13. The main provisions of the Order were that a minimum price of 6*l.* per ton and a maximum price of 6*l.* 10*s.* per ton were fixed on and after September 15, and on and after October 1 all potato dealers were to be registered, and the profits of wholesale dealers were not to exceed an average of 7*s.* 6*d.* per ton on all the potatoes sold by them. The retailer in his turn had certain maximum prices fixed for him. On September 17 the fixed prices for bread came into force, and the 4*lb.* loaf was sold over the counter for cash at not more than 9*d.*, smaller sizes and flour being retailed at proportional prices. By this time the policy of establishing maximum prices was in full swing and applied to all the important household commodities.

The need for control of other commodities than food was becoming evident and a Board of Control of the woollen and worsted industries was established by the Army Council. It was to consist of eleven representatives nominated by the Army Council, eleven representatives of the employers, and eleven representatives of the employed, each member to have an equal vote. To this Board was to be entrusted the allocation as between districts, trades, and individual firms, of the quantity of wool available for civilian trade. Its business also was to secure the most efficient execution of Government orders, and to employ to the greatest advantage the labour, material, and skill now engaged in the industry. This development is an indication of a movement which at this time was getting under way in nearly all trades; that, namely, of setting up a representative body to direct, through consultation with Government, the functions and duties of each trade.

The food economy campaign was set on foot in the middle

of the month, when it was pointed out that whereas in the earlier part of the year the great need had been for economy in wheat specifically, the need now was for economy in the use of all cereals, and the policy of finding substitutes must be given up in favour of a policy which should bring down the rate of consumption. The one abundant food of the winter was expected to be potatoes, and the public was urged to use potatoes instead of bread, bakers at the same time being advised to use an admixture of potatoes in baking the loaf. Lord Rhondda issued an invitation to Sir Arthur Yapp, who had been National Secretary of the Y M C. A., and had in that capacity shown great organising ability, to act as Director-General of Food Economy. Sir Arthur Yapp accepted the invitation to undertake this responsible work for the country. He began his duties on September 24, and the urgency of them was indicated by a statement made by Lord Rhondda to the representatives of the American, Canadian, and Australian newspapers on September 26, in which he said that the danger of the food situation lay not so much in the submarine peril as in the world-shortage of cereals, meats, and fats, and that he would have no compunction in putting Britain on compulsory rations if voluntary measures failed. He alluded to the help which was to be given by the United States and Canada, and said that unless the Allies in Europe were able to import the supplies necessary for feeding their armies and their civil populations, victory might yet slip from their grasp.

The Trades Union Congress held its annual meeting in Blackpool during September, and an address foreshadowing events to come was given by the retiring President, Mr. Hill, Secretary of the Boiler Makers. Mr. Hill declared that not one-tenth of the members of the House of Commons could be called the representatives of the common people, and something more was needed after years of persistent work by the Labour Party. Hitherto, they had been held back by the prejudice of the trade unionists against politics, but the events of the last three years, during which they had been drilled and addressed by bureaucrats from Whitehall, had taken the scales from their eyes. Trade Union rules and customs had been set aside by Acts and Orders whose name was legion. Industry and politics never had been and never could be separated, and those who had thought otherwise had stultified the efforts of trade unionists. He informed the Congress that a Joint Sub-Committee of their Parliamentary Committee and the Labour Party was negotiating now for joint premises where they would be able to co-operate in a larger sphere of work. Discussing the question of the reconstruction of industry after the war, he said that the best scheme of reconstruction would be one of their own devising—a strong and intelligent trade unionism linked with their political arm, the Labour Party. He also urged the Congress to take up more seriously the question of the international relations of the Labour movements of the world, he went on to suggest that it was

not by military methods that German democracy would be substituted for German militarism, and he declared that the right of Allied democracy to meet the common peoples of all countries for the propagation and establishment of a world democracy was contrary to the declared views of the Allied Governments. Referring to Russia, he said he had great faith in the new Government and in the liberated peoples of Russia, and that they, at least, were prepared to repudiate the Imperialistic and iniquitous aims ascribed to them by their enemies. The Congress adopted by an overwhelming majority a special report by the Parliamentary Committee declaring against an International Conference at Stockholm "at the present moment," affirming that an International Labour Conference was a necessary preliminary to the conclusion of a lasting and democratic peace; but that it must be subject to certain conditions: firstly, the attainment of general agreement of aim among the working classes of the allied nations, and secondly, that no minority in any delegation shall have more than its proportionate share of voting power.

During the summer the Irish Convention continued to sit and to discuss in secret the various proposals for the Government of Ireland. An interesting step was taken in September when arrangements were made for meetings to be held elsewhere than in Dublin. On September 4 the Convention met in Belfast City Hall and was subsequently entertained at luncheon by the Lord Mayor, when one hundred leading citizens were also present. Subsequently, the members of the Convention visited the Harbour and inspected the shipyards. On the 25th Cork was visited, when the Convention was entertained to luncheon by the Cork Harbour Board and subsequently made a tour round the principal factories and places of public importance. A motion was adopted at the meeting to refer the various schemes which had been discussed during the Convention to the Grand Committee in order that it might prepare a scheme for submission to the Convention.

A very unfortunate occurrence, however, cast a gloom just at this time on the prospects of the Convention. This was the death of Thomas Ashe, after a hunger strike, in Mountjoy Prison, Dublin. He was a National school teacher, who took a prominent part in the Irish Rebellion, afterwards being concerned in an attack upon the police, when two sergeants and four constables were killed. He was sentenced to death, a sentence afterwards commuted to penal servitude for life. He was released in the general amnesty of June, but was again arrested and sentenced by court-martial to one year's imprisonment with hard labour for attempting to incite disaffection. He demanded to be treated as a political prisoner, and when this was refused began a hunger strike. After about a week he was forcibly fed and died shortly afterwards. Up to the last moment the prison authorities had no suspicion that Ashe's life was in danger. An inquest was held on the 27th, when the Lord Mayor of Dublin

described his visits to Ashe. He tried to persuade him to give way, but Ashe replied that he had been branded as a criminal and that if he did die he would die in a good cause. Speaking with great emotion, the Lord Mayor concluded, "I left poor Ashe, he died; it is for his country to decide whether it is in a good cause or not." This incident excited very great feeling in Ireland. Ashe's body, dressed in the green uniform of the Irish Volunteers, was taken to the City Hall, where it lay in state and was viewed by thousands of people. The funeral took place on the last day of September, and was the occasion of one of the most impressive demonstrations ever seen in Dublin. There took part in the procession, which was at least three miles long, representatives of Civil, Political, and Civic Societies, Trade Unions, Women's Leagues, Sinn Fein Clubs, and a body of at least a hundred Roman Catholic priests. The Dublin Fire Brigade was represented by its engines and blue-coated firemen. The ceremonies concluded with the firing of a salute by Irish Volunteers over the grave. The remaining prisoners still refused to give way, and great relief was felt when the authorities made new rules for the treatment of prisoners in Irish prisons convicted under the Defence of the Realm Act regulations. These rules virtually permitted the Sinn Fein prisoners to be treated as political offenders.

The attacks by aircraft became increasingly severe during this month. A moonlight raid by aeroplanes occurred about midnight on September 4, when a number of Goths penetrated to the London district and dropped bombs which killed eleven and injured sixty-two. The raid was remarkable for the loud droning of the enemy machines and because it was the first occasion of an aeroplane attack on London by night. The small number of people killed was clear evidence of the importance of taking cover, and the authorities on the following day issued official advice to the public as to the importance of getting indoors as soon as it was known that a raid was threatened. It was fully expected that with the next full moon there would be a series of attacks on London, and on the 24th the first of these occurred when a few machines penetrated the defences of London and caused casualties amounting to fifteen killed and seventy injured. On the occasion of this raid London heard for the first time the heavy barrage which was put up by the guns in a new system of defence. It caused considerable alarm to some people, who hurried to the tubes or any other shelter near at hand. At the same time there was no panic. Another air-raid occurred on the following night when one raider penetrated to the south-east of London. The gunfire was at times intense, and the noise was much greater than anything London had heard previously. It became clear that more definite arrangements would have to be made with regard to warnings, and it was decided to employ more cyclist police messengers and also illuminated motor-cars bearing placards

with the "Take Cover" and "All Clear" warnings. Difficulties were also arising with regard to the crowding of the tubes, especially near the poorer districts and where alien immigrants congregated, for in such places the tube stations were sometimes crowded as early as 5.30 in the afternoon. At the end of the week attacks followed in very quick succession. On the 28th hostile aeroplanes were headed back shortly after reaching the coast. On September 29 a determined and simultaneous attack was made upon London by three groups of raiders. Only two or three penetrated the outer defences. Eleven persons were killed and eighty-two injured. The gunfire in London was terrific, and continued for over an hour and a half. Again on September 30 groups of enemy machines crossed the Kent and Essex coasts and came towards London. About ten penetrated the outer defences, but only four or five got through to London itself. On Monday, October 1, a fresh attempt was made which continued for three hours.

On October 6 Mr. Lloyd George was present at the Eisteddfod at Birkenhead, and laid stress in his speech on the importance of unity if victory was to be won. He went on to emphasise the fact that in the British Empire little nations such as Wales could maintain their patriotism to their own traditions and could yet keep up an unswerving loyalty to Britain and to the British Empire as a whole. On the following day the freedom of Birkenhead was conferred upon the Prime Minister, and in his speech of acknowledgment he declared that the trust of the Germans in their U-boats was misplaced, and that all the efforts of the submarines would not be able to beat down the strength of this Empire. He went on to lay stress on the great success which had been obtained by the employment of business men in the Government of the country. He also made some remarks on the subject of Russia. He could not deny that the machinery of Russia had broken down there for the present, but he was confident that the work of repair would succeed. M. Kerensky and his colleagues had a terrible task, but he was convinced that they were equal to it. In conclusion he insisted that in the West the Germans had been beaten in a dozen pitched battles, and that with America's entry into the war the Central Powers had to deal with a country of infinite resources that had never yet been beaten. Later in the month Mr. Asquith, speaking at Leeds at a meeting convened by the War Aims Committee, declared that the country was fighting for the peace of the world, which was worth any sacrifice except the sacrifice of those things which make peace worth having and ensure its stability. He said that the largest share of the calamities now devastating the world could be traced to the spoliation practised by Germany on France under the Treaty of 1871 and its unavoidable consequences. He insisted that a definite reply to the question whether Germany would restore Alsace-Lorraine to France and make a full reparation to Belgium

would be worth a column of the pious platitudes in which the German Chancellor had been dealing. He denied that we were aiming at the annihilation of Germany or the degradation of the German people; our one objective was Prussian militarism, and what we were aiming at was an international system under which both great and small states could be ensured a stable foundation, an independent development in a world-wide polity uniting the peoples in a federation based on justice.

Towards the end of the month a new War Loan was announced. The title of the new issue was "National War Bonds." The subscription list was opened on October 2 and was to remain open until further notice. The salient points of the new issue were: that the amount was unlimited; the rates of interest were 5 per cent, or 4 per cent free of income tax, and that elaborate rights of conversion, both of previous securities into the new loan, and of the new loan into other Government securities, were arranged. The new issue was an ingenious combination of what had hitherto been two distinct forms of Government borrowing, namely, the short-term securities hitherto called "Exchequer Bonds," and in addition three sorts of longer-dated securities, a Seven Year 5 Per Cent. Bond repayable at 103; a Ten Year 5 Per Cent Bond repayable at 105, and a Ten Year 4 Per Cent. "Income Tax Compounded" Bond repayable at par. Moreover, all these securities were for continuous sale until further notice. It was urged that the public should economise as much as possible, and should by day to day buying of the new Bonds, together with other current forms of short-dated borrowing, provide the Government with sufficient money to enable it to finance the war expenditure.

The food situation in October showed no considerable change. Scarcities were experienced in various directions, notably in bacon and tea. Of the latter, towards the end of the month, there was almost a famine, but the policy of the Food Controller in fixing maximum prices was on the whole successful. Arrangements for rationing sugar advanced several steps during the month. The retailers entitled to sell sugar had already been registered. By October 6 the public were required to send in their applications for sugar cards to the local food committees and the distribution of the cards was effected by October 26. The increase in the work of the Food Controller's staff and the need for co-operation with other Government departments led to the removal of a part of the Ministry of Food to Palace Chambers, Westminster. Mr. Prothero made an interesting speech on October 5 with reference to the agricultural position. He said that it was essential in this country to get 3,000,000 more acres under wheat, barley, oats, and potatoes. The Government was helping the farmer by guaranteed minimum prices for some of these commodities and also by providing credit and supplying trained woman labour. In discussing the question of meat prices Mr. Prothero indicated that he did not altogether see eye

to eye with his colleagues in the Government; he said that the charges of profiteering made against the farmers were absurd, and that the demands of the Government were causing a suspension in preparations for winter feeding; he also said that the meat situation was serious. He ended by declaring that the supply of food was of vital importance and might decide the issue between a defeat or victory, between ordered progress or revolution, but he confidently believed that the farmers and labourers would rival the efforts and spirit of their brothers in arms, an appeal which was reiterated a few days later by Mr. Lloyd George in a speech to a deputation from various agricultural organisations. He said that the efforts of the farmers to extend cultivation since the spring of 1917 was a highly creditable performance, and he called on them now, not merely to repeat that achievement, but to improve upon it. He laid emphasis upon the fact that it would be necessary to produce such a quantity of food in this country that we need not go into the American market and snatch food out of the mouths of our Allies.

Renewed appeals for economy were made by Sir Arthur Yapp, who explained that we were face to face, not only with submarine difficulties, but with shortages of food, of tonnage, of labourers and, probably, of money, and he appealed to everyone to practise the utmost amount of economy possible. The Government sanctioned the use of potatoes in the manufacture of bread, and appealed also for the use of potatoes, which were about the only common food-stuff that was plentiful, in other ways. The Cabinet, after consultation with Lord Rhondda, conceded the appeal of the farmers for a revision of the scale of maximum prices fixed some months previously for home killed beef for the Army. It had been arranged that a maximum of 60s. per live hundredweight should come into operation on January 1, 1918. This was now postponed until July 1, 1918.

The autumn campaign under the War Savings Movement was inaugurated by a meeting at the Royal Albert Hall on October 22, when the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer both spoke. The Prime Minister declared that our pre-eminent war-aim was the destruction of a false ideal. The real enemy was the war spirit enshrined in Potsdam, and there could be no peace or liberty for the world till that shrine was shattered. Time, he said, was on the side of the Allies. The submarine losses were growing less, and America was preparing to enter the field. Moreover, the Allies had in reserve the great weapon of economic boycott. He pleaded for unity and the postponement of all personal and sectional differences. Mr. Bonar Law said that final victory would depend as much on those at home as on the fighting men. Expenditure must be more cut down since everything depended on British credit. The burden would be heavy, but the nation would be able to endure it if the war ended rightly. He hoped that the new

War Bonds would lead to a steady and persistent flow of money loaned to the State without the financial dislocation inseparable from a great Loan. He declared that no Government would discriminate against wealth lent to the State in favour of wealth not lent to help it in its need. He repeated the opinion already expressed by Mr Lloyd George that there could be no lasting road to peace save through victory.

Much greater public attention was paid to the question of air-raids. We have already described the series of raids which occurred at the beginning of the month. After the period of the full moon the raids ceased temporarily, thus giving an opportunity for the completion of the plans of defence. Arrangements were made to provide shelters throughout London, and the system of signalling was further improved. The method adopted in the end was that of sending round messengers in motor-cars and on bicycles bearing placards in the daylight and blowing whistles in the dark, while the "All Clear" signal at night was given by boy scouts blowing on their bugles two clear notes as an indication that the danger was at an end. An attack by airships took place on October 19, and the public was a good deal bewildered by the absence of searchlights and gunfire, and the apparent ability of the enemy to drop bombs on the London area and then to get away without being molested, but depression was changed to exultation when it was known that the raiders were blown out of their course on their return to Germany, that four of them had been obliged to come down in France, and that others had drifted to the South and were in difficulties.

The adjournment of the House which had reassembled on the 16th was moved by Mr. Joynson Hicks for the discussion of the repeated raids and the lack of defence. Mr Bonar Law, in replying, declared that the previous Friday's raid was the greatest defeat that Germany had ever suffered. He explained that the searchlights had not been turned on, so as to avoid conveying to the raiders any information as to where they were, and he begged of the House and the country to keep their nerve which the Germans believed they would be able to destroy by these repeated raids.

On the 4th General Smuts, at a luncheon at which he was the guest of the Association of Chambers of Commerce, announced that it was the intention of the Government to carry out reprisals. He repeated his firm declaration that the Germans were already beaten, and that the enemy in his impotent rage was now more and more striking at this country through its non-combatants—women and children.

Other important speeches on the war and our military policy were made during this month by Sir Auckland Geddes, Mr. Asquith, and General Smuts. Sir Auckland Geddes made his first appearance on a public platform as Minister of National Service at Edinburgh on October 3. It had become clear

that the original scheme of national service built up under the direction of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, was completely changed. Sir Auckland Geddes reduced the machinery of the department, and expected to save 100,000*l.* a month in salaries, office expenses, and advertising, his intention was to use existing machinery wherever this was possible. In outlining his policy the new Minister declared that a system of industrial co-operation was now contemplated, and that the transferences of labour which were necessary, would be carried out by the machinery which labour itself had constructed. His Ministry would determine the relative importance of various forms of civil work and prepare lists of reserved occupations. There was, he said, no intention at present to raise the legal military age, though such a decision might become necessary later on. He laid stress on the increasing need for the labour of women who, he said, were not coming forward in sufficient numbers. On the 9th, at Nottingham, Sir Auckland Geddes made further important announcements. He said that four great fields of civil national effort required more men—*viz.*, the shipyards, the production of steel, the making of aerodromes, and the production of aircraft and aero-engines. What was to be done to get labour? He proposed to beg, borrow, or persuade to work with him every body of civil organisation now existing that could be made to serve the turn. He proposed to use the employment exchanges, the trade unions, and societies of employers' federations. He proposed to ask for men for specific jobs, and not to ask barristers to act as navvies. He appealed for volunteers for the great seasonable occupations like hay-making and harvest, and warned the class of person who employed a mass of domestics, chauffeurs, or gardeners that this waste of human power had got to stop. He also appealed for more help from the women, but he wished to avoid drawing away the single-handed maids of the small, middle-class homes with several young children. He insisted that there was a great mass of young, healthy, middle-class femininity which was really doing nothing to help the war along. He described the new system of medical examination, and the abolition of the old system of medical categories which was to be replaced by four grades of physical fitness.

Mr. Asquith, speaking at a National War Aims meeting in Liverpool on October 11, declared that there was no doubt a genuine demand for peace in Germany, and signs of revolt in the Reichstag itself, but the German Government had studiously avoided answering plain questions. Herr Kuhlmann's one definite contribution to the cause of peace was a flat negation of France's right to Alsace-Lorraine, and he preserved a significant silence on the restoration of Belgium. The worst thing which could happen to the world would be a patched-up peace which would merely contain the germs of future trouble. Nothing but a real and abiding peace could justify the suffering

and sacrifice caused by the war. He ended by declaring that in a test of endurance the outlook of this country was hopeful, for the material, no less than the moral predominance rested manifestly and increasingly with the cause of the Allies.

General Smuts, speaking at Cardiff on October 29, declared that in this struggle we were deciding upon what basis the future would be built, whether on freedom, or on the will to power and the will to force. He was not fighting for the British Empire, but he was fighting because far more than any Empire was at stake in this great struggle, and if the Allies failed the cause of civilisation would be swept back for many a century. He admitted that the cause of the Allies was suffering at the moment a downward move. The position of Italy was no doubt serious, but the war was not decided in Serbia or Roumania, nor, said he, will it be decided in Italy. The assault on Italy might prolong the war, but it could not affect the issue.

CHAPTER III.

THE AUTUMN SESSION.

PARLIAMENT reassembled on October 16, the main business for the autumn session being the Franchise Bill and the new Vote of Credit; it was also expected that progress would be made with the Education Bill. The Boundary Commissioners had already put forward their plans for redistribution. They proposed to add thirty-one members to the number at present representing Great Britain, and their scheme also provided for a new distribution of political power by which the industrial and urban elements would gain at the expense of the agricultural and rural elements. Greater London, it was proposed, should have 101 members; Lancashire, sixty-six; Birmingham and its environs, forty-one; Glasgow and its environs, thirty-two. When the House of Commons began its discussion on the Reform Bill, it was confronted with an Irish difficulty. The Bill, in accordance with the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference, applied the new franchises to Ireland, but confined the redistribution to Great Britain. Sir John Lonsdale, the Ulster Unionist leader, pointed out the resultant dilemma. The Bill, he declared, was based on a party compromise involving the accepted principles of "one man one vote" and "one vote one value," but without redistribution in Ireland the second principle could not come into operation. He suggested a rearrangement of the Irish constituencies which would not prejudice any settlement which might result from the Irish Convention. Mr. Redmond urged that a compromise made by the Speaker's Conference ought not to be disturbed. Sir George Cave, for the Government, admitted that a strong case had been made out for consideration, and if the House so

desired they would at once appoint an Irish Boundary Commission and endeavour to get a scheme framed. The only alternative, he contended, was to exclude Ireland from the Bill, a course which he was very unwilling to adopt. Mr. Duke said hopefully that it was not likely that the period when the Bill resulting from the Irish Convention could be introduced would be long delayed, and the true place in which to deal with this subject would be in that Bill, which would take into consideration the whole of the circumstances in Ireland. On the next day Sir George Cave said that the view of the Government was that if Ireland was to be included in the Bill an attempt should be made to redistribute the seats already allotted to it. It was therefore the duty of the Government to prepare a scheme of redistribution and to put it before the House at a later stage of the Bill. On this understanding Sir John Lonsdale withdrew an amendment proposing that the whole Bill should not apply to Ireland, but the Nationalists made no secret of their objections to the course proposed by the Government. The discussion on the Bill, when resumed on October 24, turned on the provision of facilities for the exercise of the franchise by soldiers, sailors, and merchant seamen. The Government proposed a postal vote from those who could be readily reached from this country and a proxy vote from those who were in distant parts. Mr. Herbert Samuel proposed an amendment which was accepted by the Government, limiting the experiment to the period of the war and six months afterwards. Mr. Samuel held the view that the proxy vote was a thoroughly bad system, it was not so much giving a man a vote as giving him power to nominate an additional elector. On the following day Sir George Cave explained more fully the Government proposal for the use of proxies, and the House finally agreed to a Government amendment to the clause enabling not only the wife, but the husband, parent, brother, or sister of an elector to be appointed as a proxy. Later in that evening the Government sustained their first defeat in the House of Commons since they came into office in the preceding December. It was on the question of the payment of Royalties on petroleum raised under the powers conferred by the Petroleum Production Bill. The Land Values group resisted the resolution on the ground that the Crown had the right to any petroleum which might be found, and should not, therefore, pay Royalties to the owner of the land. The Government was defeated by 44 votes to 35.

The Irish situation was discussed on the 23rd on a resolution by Mr. Redmond deplored the policy pursued by the Irish Executive Committee and the Irish Military authorities at a time when the highest interests of Ireland and the Empire demanded the creation of an atmosphere favourable to a successful result for the deliberations of the Irish Convention. Mr. Redmond declared that the continuance of the present policy might imperil the success of the Convention and plunge Irishmen into

anarchy. Mr. Duke in his answer defended the use of repressive measures. The unenrolled young men were being enrolled for the creation of a new rebellion, and some of the leaders of this organised sedition were the very men who had been released from prisons in order to create an atmosphere of goodwill for the Convention. He closed his speech with a declaration of his determination not to permit criminal misconduct or incitement to it. The Prime Minister said it was the firm intention of the Government to put down organisations for rebellion and made certain disclosures as to recent attempts to land arms in Ireland, but the most interesting part of his speech was when, in answer to a challenge from Mr. Dillon, he declared categorically that if a substantial agreement was reached by the Convention the Government would use all their power to give it legislative form without a moment's delay.

At the very end of the month, Mr. Bonar Law asked the House of Commons to sanction the fourth Vote of Credit for the year, for 400,000,000*l.* The daily expenditure was still six and a half million pounds, or about a million in excess of the Budget estimate, but when certain recoverable items were taken into consideration, the real daily increase was not more than 239,000*l.* He said that he had had to consider seriously whether he should introduce a supplementary budget, but he decided against that course in the interests of the country, and he declared that though we could not bear the existing strain indefinitely, still, it would not be want of money which would prevent us from winning the war, and insisted that Germany was in a much more disadvantageous position than Great Britain.

Other important events of the month must be mentioned briefly. Among these were the decision to increase the pay of soldiers and sailors and the first meetings of Lord Bryce's Committee on the reconstruction of the House of Lords, and the place it should occupy in the constitution. The Committee, which was constituted on the model of that on the Reform of the Franchise over which the Speaker had presided, met in secret. On the 26th of the month the Financial Committee on National Expenditure which was appointed in July, issued its first report. It stated that the gross cost of the war to September 30, 1917, very nearly equalled 5,000,000,000*l.* and that it was estimated that for each succeeding six months of war a sum of 750,000,000*l.* would be added to the National Debt. It recommended that the Imperial General Staff should be required to take into consideration the comparative cost of alternative military proposals before reaching their conclusions, and that the War Office should specially review the method of comparative statistics with a view to its extended use as a means of checking waste; that steps should be taken to secure greater financial control over the Ministry of Munitions, and that the War Cabinet and the General Staff should reconsider the advisability of keeping so many Army units at home.

Some little excitement was caused at the end of the month by the candidature of Mr. Ben Tillett in opposition to a Coalition candidate for a vacancy at Salford. Mr. Tillett's platform was the vigorous prosecution of the war, better payment for soldiers and sailors and their dependents, more direct Government control of the necessities of life, the control of profiteering in food, and air-raid reprisals on a large scale.

We may close the account of the month by mentioning some important developments in the labour world. The most important of these was the announcement that the Labour Party had decided on a reorganisation of its constitution. The particulars were issued on October 18, and made provision for individual membership of the party, in place of membership only of such bodies as trade unions and socialist societies. A local Labour Party was to be established in each Parliamentary Constituency, with separate sections for men and women, and the National Executive was to be enlarged to twenty members, four of whom were to be women. It was stated that among the objects of the party was to secure to the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that might be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production. It was proposed to co-operate with the labour organisations of the Dominions and Dependencies and the labour organisations in other countries, and "to assist in organising the federation of nations for the maintenance of freedom and peace, and for the establishment of suitable machinery for adjustment and settlement of international disputes by conciliation or judicial arbitration, and for such international legislation as may be practicable." It was subsequently announced that Mr. Arthur Henderson had resigned the Chairmanship of the Parliamentary Labour Party (he was at the same time Secretary of the Labour Party) in order to meet the demands which the new scheme of party reorganisation would make on his time. Mr. Adamson was elected his successor. Almost simultaneously it was announced that at a special conference of co-operators, it had been decided that the co-operative movement should enter the political arena with a definite policy of industrial, social, and economic reform. The Conference unanimously adopted a draft scheme for the representation of co-operators in Parliament and on Municipal bodies.

On the last day of the month the House of Lords returned to the question of the sale of honours. Lord Selborne and Lord Loreburn both gave illustrations of the practice, the latter giving an instance where a friend of his had been approached with the proposal that he should pay 25,000*l.* for a baronetcy or 15,000*l.* for a knighthood. Lord Curzon replied for the Government, and agreed that the Government should carry out the general proposition put forward in the motion that the grant of an honour should be accompanied by a public statement of the

reasons for which it had been made, and he accepted for the Government the position that the Prime Minister should satisfy himself that no payment or expectation of payment to a party fund was associated with the grant of an honour.

On the 4th, during the Committee stage of the Franchise Bill, a debate arose on the proposal to disfranchise conscientious objectors. Mr. Bonar Law announced that he intended to vote for disfranchisement, on the ground that a distinction should be made between those who had given service in the war and those who had withheld it. At the same time, he expressed his preference for the limitation of disfranchisement to a term of years. On the following day Lord Hugh Cecil expressed his view that the vote must not be refused to people who took views that they sincerely believed to be right upon moral or religious grounds, merely because those grounds were regarded as mistaken. He appealed to the House not to listen to the Prussian doctrine, that the interest of the State must be supreme. It was announced that the Labour Party would vote against the proposal, and after Sir George Cave had contended that it was wrong to impose a disability upon a man for taking advantage of his statutory right under the Military Service Act, the division was taken, the Government Whips being withdrawn. The amendment was carried by 209 votes to 171. Later in the evening Mr. Aneurin Williams moved an amendment for the purpose of reinstating proportional representation in the Bill.

We have already referred to the opinion strongly held in some quarters that the Air Board was insufficient for the purpose of maintaining our aerial supremacy, and that it was necessary that an Air Ministry should be constituted. Early in the month it was rumoured in the Lobby that a Bill to be introduced in a few days' time would provide for the co-ordination by successive stages of the work of the Naval and Military Air Services and of the Air Board, and that it would also be given powers over discipline and pay. The Bill was introduced on the 9th, and was a landmark in the history both of aviation and of the Air Forces of the country. It recognised the air as no less a distinctive fighting element than the sea and the land, and provided for the establishment of a third service to be called the Air Force. The Bill established an Air Council whose President was to become a sixth Secretary of State. (The number of Secretaries of State who could sit in the House of Commons was thus increased to five instead of four.) On the 13th a great sensation was created by a letter addressed to the Prime Minister and published in the Press from Lord Northcliffe, refusing an invitation to take charge of the new Air Ministry. The latter stated that he felt he could do better work if he maintained his independence and was not gagged by a loyalty that he did not feel towards the whole of the administration. The next day, November 17, there appeared in the Press a letter to the Prime Minister from Lord Cowdray, the Head of the Air Board, in which he said that he

should not have been left to receive from Lord Northcliffe's letter to *The Times* the first intimation that the Prime Minister desired a change at the Ministry, and that the latter, therefore, could not be surprised at receiving Lord Cowdray's resignation. On November 27 it was announced that Lord Rothermere, the brother of Lord Northcliffe, had been appointed to be President of the Air Council. Lord Rothermere had been with his brother for many years Director of the Amalgamated Press. The Air Force Bill came before the House of Lords on November 27, when the Standing Orders were suspended, as it was urgent that it should receive the Royal assent as speedily as possible. One or two amendments designed to secure administrative efficiency were made, and the Bill as amended was returned to the House and immediately read a third time, and passed.

On November 26 Mr. Bonar Law made a statement in the House of Commons on the increase of Army and Navy pay. An additional penny a day was to be given to all British soldiers for each complete year of service since the outbreak of war. Hospital stoppages were to be abolished except in cases where the man was in hospital through his own fault. The compulsory allotment for the support of dependents up to certain limits was now to be paid by the State, and a minimum of 1s 6d. a day for all privates was introduced. There were advances for special proficiency and also for the higher non-commissioned ranks. Similar advances were made in the pay of the Navy and Marines. These were estimated to amount altogether to 65,000,000*l.* for the first year and 69,000,000*l.* for the second year.

On November 13 a Bill was introduced to extend the life of Parliament for another eight months. This was the fourth time that such a Bill had been brought into the House. The period was chosen in order that there might be a chance, if the Representation of the People Bill was passed by Christmas, of having the new register ready in time for an election six months later. About a fortnight later it was announced that not only the present Parliament but the present session must be prolonged, and that the House would meet again after Christmas.

On November 22 the Food Controller issued an order prohibiting the sale or use of cream between December 8, 1917, and April 30, 1918, except for the purpose of making butter or for consumption by invalids, young children, or other persons upon a doctor's order.

One rather difficult question was the price of potatoes. It was necessary, on the one hand, to guarantee a minimum price to the grower in order to stimulate production, but, on the other hand, the large crop of potatoes and the needs of the public for some cheap food made it desirable that the price should be lowered to the consumer. Mr. Clynes announced in the House of Commons on November 8 that the Government had decided to modify the Potato Order by abolishing the

minimum price of 6*l* a ton, and allowing free markets for sales by growers throughout the United Kingdom, subject to the continuance of the existing maximum price of 6*l* 10*s* per ton. Provision was also made, in order to fulfil the pledge given to growers, to compensate them for sales at a lower figure than 6*l* per ton.

It became apparent during the month that the Food Controller's scheme of sugar distribution did not provide for those people who by reason of their occupation must frequently move from place to place, or for those who having been registered as members of a household had ceased to be members of that household. It was found necessary to introduce individual registration in order to meet these cases, and it was announced that such persons after compliance with certain formalities would be supplied with a ration paper on the production of which at any post office they would obtain sugar coupons permitting them to purchase sugar from any retailer during the period of eight weeks. In order to bring this new system into line with the system of household registration, it became necessary for certain fresh forms to be filled up in respect of each member of the household.

On November 3 Sir Arthur Yapp launched the second stage of his new campaign for food economy, and said that he was initiating for it a League of National Safety, in which every citizen should at once enrol himself by undertaking to practise every possible economy in the use of food and the checking of waste. He stated that the entry of America into the war meant much for the Allies, but that every man sent from the United States to fight in France would have to be fed and clothed from overseas, which would require increased tonnage. Every boat-load of food that could be saved would mean another boat available for the soldiers. The Food Controller had authorised him to say that he was anxious to avoid compulsory rationing but would not hesitate to recommend to the Cabinet whatever restrictions might be necessary, including compulsory rationing, if the present appeal did not give the results desired.

On November 12 Sir Arthur Yapp announced a new scale of voluntary rations. The bread ration was now to vary from 8 lb. per week for men on the heaviest manual work to 3 lb 8 oz. for women on sedentary work. For other foods for all adults the suggested ration was as follows.—

		Per week
		lb. oz.
Cereals other than bread	- - - - -	0 12
Meat	- - - - -	2 0
Butter, Margarine, Oils, and Fats	- - - - -	0 10
Sugar	- - - - -	0 8

In announcing this scale of rations in a speech to the Manchester Control Committee, Sir Arthur Yapp said the children were not included, and that it was vital to the national interests

that their food supplies should not be stinted. He said that compulsory rationing might come, but the problem was not so easy as it looked. It would involve an immense amount of organisation, using labour which could be more profitably employed elsewhere, while the issue of tickets would not guarantee the supply of food

Sir Auckland Geddes made, in the course of the month, some interesting speeches on the Man-Power problem. Speaking at Plymouth on November 12, he dwelt on the need for men and women for the Army, and said that they must be obtained by a drastic comb-out of civilians. He declared that our duties were (1) to maintain our Armies in the field; (2) to maintain and extend our Air Service, (3) to maintain and extend our Fleet, and (4) to build more ships, to make more munitions, to grow more food. He dwelt upon the amount of waste and extravagance which was still practised by the nation, for instance in ladies' clothing. He said that what we really wanted at present was a steady supply of labour to build aeroplanes. He also wanted immediately a further 10,000 clerks, typists, cooks, waitresses, women of all sorts for the W.A.A.C.'s. He stated that his department was card-indexing the whole of the Army at home, and that he hoped soon to get back into civil life men permanently unfit for active service but still of practically full industrial value. He ended by declaring that the call for men was going to be heavy, that the weight of the strain was going to come almost at once, and that the end was not yet. Speaking at the Aldwych Club on November 14, he described the work of his department, and then went on to say that age was not a suitable basis for recruiting men to the Army in the type of civilisation which we have to-day. He said that the right basis was occupation, though the actual withdrawal of the men may be conditioned by their age to some extent and by their physical fitness. He suggested that in recruiting the State should first of all draw upon the internal luxury trades. He declared that the winter and the following spring would see the maximum effort of this country, and that it must be an absolutely unprecedented maximum; therefore he appealed to the whole country to see that each one made the least possible demand upon the energy of their fellow-countrymen.

But the event of greatest importance in relation to the prosecution of the war was the announcement of the formation of the Allied War Council. Mr. Lloyd George had been in France and was present at a luncheon given by M. Painlevé at the Ministry of War, and there the English Premier described the situation in very pessimistic words, declaring that unless some change were effected he could no longer remain responsible for a war direction doomed to disaster through lack of unity. He referred to the new War Council as calculated to achieve the real unity which is the only sure pathway to Victory. On the same day Mr. Bonar Law informed the House of Commons that

with a view to the better co-ordination of military action, a War Council, composed of the Prime Minister and a member of the Governments of France, Italy, and Great Britain, had been constituted to meet at Versailles normally not less than once a month, and it was hoped that other Great Powers, and especially the United States, would join the Council. On the following day Mr Asquith invited the Prime Minister to answer certain specific questions. Mr. Lloyd George at once read the terms of the agreement, and in his subsequent speech he emphasised the fact that the Council would have no executive power, and that the final decisions in matters of strategy would rest with the several Governments. He then offered to set aside the following Monday for a debate on his Paris speech, and the offer was at once accepted.

When this debate came on, Mr. Lloyd George explained how previous resolutions for Allied co-ordination had all come to naught, and that he had feared that the plan approved of at Rapallo would end in the same way. "I had made up my mind," the Prime Minister declared, "to take all risks, and—I took them, to get public sentiment behind that document, not in England merely, but in France, Italy, and America. It is not easy to arouse public opinion. I may know nothing about military strategy, but I do know something of political strategy, so I set out to deliver a disagreeable speech that would force everybody to talk about this scheme, and they have talked about it throughout two or three continents." Mr. Lloyd George continued by asserting that there had been no interference with soldiers by the politicians, and declared that the whole campaign of the year had been the result of the advice of the soldiers. He added to the effect of his speech by informing the House that five submarines had been destroyed on the previous Saturday.

About this time a serious labour crisis had arisen in the railway world. The Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen demanded an increase of wages of 10s per week, while the Railway Executive Committee refused to give a larger sum than 5s. In order to force a decision a meeting of railway workers in the Liverpool district decided to adopt what is known as a "go-slow strike," which it was expected would tie up traffic hopelessly in a few days. This action led to the breaking off of negotiations in London, but a meeting of delegates of the railwaymen from all parts of the country repudiated the action of the Liverpool members, and appealed to them to resume normal working. On the next day, November 29, it was announced that the Liverpool men had given way, and communications were reopened with the Railway Executive when a settlement was arrived at by the whole of the traffic men receiving an advance of 6s. a week, the agreement to date back three weeks. The total cost of this concession was estimated at about 9,500,000*l* a year.

A great sensation was caused at the end of November by the publication in the *Daily Telegraph* of a letter from Lord Lansdowne advocating a negotiated peace. There was some speculation as to whether the letter represented in any way the views of the Government or of the Unionist leaders, and it was even rumoured that Lord Lansdowne had been in touch with Mr. Asquith on the subject. But two days later a semi-official communiqué stated that Lord Lansdowne had not been in communication with any member of the Government, and that the views in the letter did not in any way represent the views of His Majesty's Government. Mr. Asquith, speaking at Birmingham in the second week of December, said that he had no more knowledge than any member of the Government of Lord Lansdowne's letter until he saw it in the Press, and he had no responsibility, direct or indirect, for its terms. But some of its critics, he declared, had read into it meanings and intentions which he, Mr. Asquith, did not. He went on to discuss the aims of the Allies in relation to the German Empire, and quoted President Wilson who had said, "No one is threatening the existence, the independence, the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire." Mr. Asquith asserted that none of the Allies intended to prescribe the internal constitution of Germany in the future. But if there was to be a real pact it must rest on authentic proof that the German people were ready to set up the rule of common and equal right.

On the 14th the Prime Minister, speaking at a dinner given by the Benchers of Gray's Inn, referred to Lord Lansdowne's letter, and declared that it was a great misfortune, that if Lord Lansdowne meant to say exactly the same thing as President Wilson, he did not carry out that intention. The extreme pacifist, he declared, was not the danger, but he wished to warn the nation against the man who thought that there was a half-way house between defeat and victory. To end a war entered upon in order to enforce a treaty, without reparation for the infringement of that treaty, merely by entering into a new and more comprehensive treaty, would indeed be a farce in the setting of a tragedy. Speaking of the war situation, Mr. Lloyd George said that the operations of the Air Service would probably have a greater effect than any other weapon in determining the nations that this must be the last war. The deadly grip of the British Navy, he declared, was having its effect, and the valour of our troops was making an impression which in the end would tell. Had Russia been in a condition to exert her strength, we might now be in a position to impose terms of peace. Her retirement, he declared, strengthened Hohenzollernism and weakened the forces of democracy. But if they were then at the worst moment, it was because Russia had stopped and America was only preparing to come in. He went on to describe the methods to be adopted to raise more men and to increase tonnage, and warned his audience that in order to have men it would be

necessary to interfere to an even greater extent than had been done already with the industries not absolutely essential to the prosecution of the war or the maintenance of the life of the nation.

The Franchise Bill entered on its last stages in the House of Commons early in December. On the 4th Sir George Cave moved the recommittal of the Bill for the insertion of new Government proposals on the disqualification of conscientious objectors and on Irish redistribution. With regard to the first, he explained that it was not desired to disfranchise objectors who had worked for the country during the war in some other direction than military service. He also sought to give effect to Mr Bonar Law's declaration that there should be some time limit to the disqualification. Lord Hugh Cecil attempted to secure the adoption of amendments which went beyond the scheme of the Government, but was defeated by 231 votes to 176. The Irish then attacked the section of the Bill dealing with redistribution in Ireland. Mr Redmond charged the Government with a breach of faith in bringing forward a proposal which had not been recommended at the Speaker's Conference, and contended that the only reason for the proposal was to make provision for the contingency that the Convention might break down, a position against the adoption of which he vehemently protested. Mr Duke, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, replied that he was satisfied that there was as great a possibility of the success of the Convention as there had been at any time during the past four months, and added that if the Convention came to an agreement nothing would give him greater delight than to render inoperative every part of the Reform Bill applying to Ireland, a statement which was later on reiterated by Sir George Cave who was in charge of the Bill. In the end the debate was adjourned until next day. When it was resumed, the Nationalists again insisted on treating the Irish redistribution scheme as a grievance of serious character, and Mr Dillon made a vigorous speech, in which he charged Ministers with doing all in their power to create an atmosphere which would be fatal to the Convention, and asserted that if the Government carried their proposal and the Convention failed, they would have to govern Ireland by the naked sword. Mr Runciman and other English members appealed for a free vote of the House, but this the Government refused, and the amendment was rejected by 217 votes to 163. The Nationalists sought to delay the passage of the Bill by bringing forward a series of detailed amendments for the rest of the evening. When the House of Commons met on the 6th, the attack on the Ministers by the Irish Party was at once resumed, and the Irish members were supported by Mr Herbert Samuel, who declared that they could not be blamed for the strong feeling which they had shown. Sir George Cave refused to abandon the principle of Irish redistribution, but offered to

facilitate a satisfactory settlement on the details of the scheme. The House then went into Committee on the new Government proposals for the disqualification of conscientious objectors. It was decided that the period of disqualification of conscientious objectors should continue during the war and for five years afterwards. An amendment was also accepted, the effect of which was that a person who had been exempted from combatant service, but who had to perform disciplined service should not be subject to disqualification. On the motion of Mr Herbert Samuel, the last vestige of Major Chapple's complicated scheme for alternative voting in three-cornered contests was removed, and the clause was restored in its original form. On the next day very great satisfaction was felt when it was announced that an agreement had been reached between the Government, the Nationalists, and the Ulstermen in regard to the Irish redistribution scheme. The two Irish Parties were to be invited to settle matters for themselves in a Conference of their own choosing under the impartial chairmanship of the Speaker. The ready acceptance of this arrangement by both Nationalists and Ulstermen was fully in keeping with the spirit of the Convention, and excited great pleasure among English members who had been considerably disturbed by the acrimonious debates of the two preceding days. The decisions of the Conference were to be embodied in a new Bill which was to pass as an agreed Bill, and to be submitted for the Royal assent at the same time as the Franchise Bill. The Bill was then read a third time and several speakers expressed the feeling of the House in offering to Sir George Cave, the Home Secretary, congratulations on his conduct of the Bill and its results. The second reading of the Bill was formally moved in the House of Lords on December 17, and a two days' debate took place, in the course of which most speakers expressed only a very qualified approval of the Bill.

Lord Curzon, replying on behalf of the Government at the end of the debate, said he was not able to contend that this was a perfect Bill, but that on the whole it was a wise and statesman-like attempt to solve one of the greatest difficulties of the time. He insisted that it was not a Government Bill in the ordinary sense of the term. It was really a Parliamentary Bill and a People's Bill in which the Government had given such assistance as they could to enable the Parliament of the people to carry into effect the views which a large number of them held. But if they dealt with the question of the Franchise, they could not exclude the question of the new register or the readjustment of the minor anomalies of the present system. Members would be left to vote as they pleased on proportional representation and Women's Suffrage.

The Non-ferrous Metals Bill was brought up for its second reading on December 3. It sought to eliminate enemy influence in this country from the control of such metals and ores as zinc,

copper, tin, lead, nickel, and aluminium, and made it unlawful during the war and five years afterwards for any company or individual to deal in such metals without a licence from the Board of Trade. The reason for the introduction of the Bill was that there was stated to be in existence a German combination for the control of the metal trade of the world. The rejection of the Bill was moved by Mr. J. M. Henderson, who denied that the principal metals had ever been controlled by Germany, and warned the Government that they could not boycott Germany economically after the war. Much opposition came from many quarters, and ultimately the debate was adjourned until December 11, when the extreme free traders in the House made a determined attack upon the Bill. Mr. Runciman asked the Government whether they had considered how far the policy of the Bill conflicted with the economic policy of our greatest ally, the United States. Mr. Bonar Law in defending the Bill asked the House to realise that one of the strongest weapons which the Allies held was that unless our enemy could compel the United States and this country to make peace, it would be impossible for them to achieve their desires, although the Bill had not in itself any reference to a need for economic warfare. He gave our enemies this warning, "The longer war lasts, the less raw material there will be to go round, and as the Allies will help themselves first, the less there will be for Germany to receive." The debate continued during the whole sitting, and at 11 o'clock Sir Albert Stanley had to move the closure. Three divisions took place in each of which the opponents of the Bill were defeated.

When the Committee stage came on, the free-trade group renewed their attack. Mr. Leif Jones declared that the last thing the traders of this country wanted was Government meddling in their business. Mr. Runciman argued that the subjection of the trade to purely bureaucratic control would create opportunities for lobbying and "corridoring". On behalf of the Bill the rejoinder was made that the metal traders of Glasgow and the Federation of British Industries were in favour of it. Various hostile amendments were pressed to a vote in all of which the Government was victorious, though once by a relatively small majority, sixty-eight.

On December 12, Mr. Bonar Law asked the House of Commons for the Fifth Vote of Credit during the financial year. It was for a sum of 550,000,000*l.*, bringing the aggregate amount voted for 1917-18 to that date to the colossal figure of 2,450,000,000*l.* In introducing the new vote, Mr. Bonar Law announced that the Government had sent a donation of 1,000,000*l.* to the Canadian city of Halifax which had been wrecked by the explosion of a ship carrying munitions. He foreshadowed the imposition of additional taxation in the next Budget. The average daily expenditure, he explained, for the

first thirty-five weeks of the financial year was 6,686,000*l.*, or an excess over the Budget estimate of 1,275,000*l.*, but allowing for recoverable expenditure the real daily excess over the estimate was only 350,000*l.* Mr McKenna contended that our revenue on the existing basis of taxation was not sufficient to meet the ordinary charges of Government on a peace basis together with the charge for pensions and debt, and declared that the sound principle had been abandoned that no expenditure should be authorised until provision had been made by taxation for the interest on the borrowed money. Mr Adamson, the new chairman of the Labour Party, urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to impose heavier taxes, and insisted that conscription of at least a portion of the wealth of the nation ought to be considered.

An interesting announcement was made in the House of Commons on December 11, when Mr. Bonar Law said that the British Government had been informed in September through a neutral diplomatic channel that the German Government would be glad to make a communication relative to peace. The British Government had replied that they would be prepared to receive any such communication and to discuss it with their Allies. They had informed the principal Allied Governments of the German suggestion and of their reply. No answer had been returned, and no other official communication had been received.

On the 4th the treatment of conscientious objectors was discussed in the House of Lords, when Lord Curzon, replying to Lord Salisbury, said that he was in communication with the Home Secretary and the Secretary for War on the question whether there were men serving in the Army who would have been given exemption on conscientious grounds had the Tribunal been aware that they had power to give absolute exemption. With regard to present treatment, the prison rules were to be mitigated with regard to men who had served twelve months' imprisonment. They were to be allowed to wear their own clothes and afforded facilities for exercise, correspondence, visits, and reading. Arrangements were also being made for dealing with prisoners who, because they were in a poor state of health, were recommended for release.

The report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on national expenditure was issued during December. It dealt with the question of Parliamentary estimates during the war, the control by the Treasury, the control of the departments and the effect on national expenditure, of the increase of prices and the causes of that increase. The report stated that while detailed control by the Treasury was not possible in time of war, the control now being exercised fell far short of the needs of the case. They recommended that the staff of the Treasury should be strengthened by the addition of men of ability and of administrative experience from outside; that the Treasury should exer-

cise more active financial supervision over the departments, and that it should inquire into the numbers and working of the large clerical staffs recruited by the various departments during the war. The report stated that the chief causes of the increase in prices were the extension of credit during the war, the demand for commodities exceeding the supply, and the inadequacy of any Government action to control prices; increase of wages and consequent increase in the cost of production, increase in the rates of profit and unfavourable rates of exchange in some countries from which supplies are imported. Some of these were at once effects of the increase in prices and causes of further increases. The report recommended that the Government should take all measures possible to avoid the creation of new credits in financing the war; that the measures for the limitation of profits should be continued and strengthened, and should be made more widely known to the people, and that the strongest case should be required to be established before any advance of wages is conceded on any ground other than the rise in the cost of living, and that a single policy under the general direction of one authority should be adopted in all instances in the determination of wage questions.

As regards food, sporadic shortages began to be obvious in the course of the month, and food queues became more serious. During the second week of the month it was very difficult to obtain butter and margarine. Tea also remained short, and both meat and fish were difficult to get and very dear. Almost the only articles of food which were cheap and plentiful were apples and potatoes. The queues became more prevalent and created great dissatisfaction among the working classes, the women of which had sometimes to wait several hours in the bitter cold (it was an exceptionally cold December) in order to make necessary purchases. The Birmingham Food Control Committee sent a deputation to Lord Rhondda on December 12, in order to put before him a scheme whereby each household should be supplied with a card entitling him to prescribed rations of tea, butter, and margarine to be procured from a particular registered retailer. No retailer was to be allowed to register a larger number of customers than his staff or premises permitted him to serve with reasonable promptitude. The Local Food Committee was to have control of the supplies of all commodities in the city so that each retailer would receive neither more nor less than the quantities needed to cover the requirements of his registered customers. The Birmingham representatives received permission to put this scheme into operation. On the 7th it was announced in the House that the Ministry of Food was about to set up a Consumers' Council, of which Mr. Clynes was to be President, and which would contain representatives of the organised working classes, of women, and of the co-operators. On December 18 Lord Rhondda, addressing the North London Food Control Committees, said that food queues must be stopped.

immediately, and expressed disappointment that local committees had not shown more initiative in stopping them. He stated that probably compulsory rationing would have to come. It was announced shortly before Christmas that there was to be a meatless day each week, and that butchers were to sell only three-quarters of the amount of meat that they had sold in October, 1917. On the 21st Lord Rhondda made an order giving powers to the Local Food Committees to control supplies of margarine in their areas and to make arrangements for the equitable distribution of such supplies between the various provision shops in the district. The committee was to be able to requisition surplus supplies from any shop and transfer these to any other provision shop in their area. Immediate use was made by many Local Food Control Committees of the powers given to them. In Camberwell, Wandsworth, Hammersmith, and other districts, stocks were taken from the shops which had large supplies and distributed among other retailers who had no margarine to sell, while in the provinces also schemes were under consideration, or, as at Norwich and Leicester, the requisition of margarine was already being carried out. On December 27 maximum prices came into operation with regard to dealings in live cattle and dead meat. For instance, the maximum price for the first grade of bulls, bullocks, and heifers was 75s. per cwt. On December 29 it was announced that the voluntary ration for fats of 10 oz. per week was excessive, and that consumption should be limited to 4 oz. of margarine and 1 oz. of butter per week for each person.

During the course of the month the Labour Organisations had been very active in demanding that the Government should restate our war-aims, and also in taking steps on their own account to furnish a statement of conditions of peace which the Labour Party would deem to be satisfactory. It was decided to present this to a special Conference of the societies affiliated to the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress. The most important sections of the memorandum were those demanding the establishment of a super-national authority or league of nations, an international high court, an international legislature, and compulsory arbitration between nations; it demanded also the democratisation of all countries, the suppression of secret diplomacy, concerted action for the limitation of armaments, and the universal abolition of compulsory military service. It demanded the restoration of Belgium, the right of Alsace-Lorraine to decide on its future political position, and proposed that the Colonies of the European powers in tropical Africa should be transferred to the super-national authority and administered as a single independent African State with its own staff. It also declared against all projects for economic war after peace had been declared. When the Conference ultimately met on December 28, about 750 delegates were present, forming as representative a Convention of the British Labour Movement

as could be brought together. At the opening of the Conference a letter was read from the Prime Minister declaring that the statement on war-aims could only be made in agreement with the Allies, but intimating that the question was constantly kept in view. He declared that we were fighting to-day for precisely the same ideals as those for which we entered the war. The speeches made at the Conference showed that in spite of this and many like assurances Labour was inclined to hold the British and the Allied Governments under suspicion of militarist or imperialistic designs. All through the discussion ran the fear that unless the workers made their feelings known and took an active part in bringing about a settlement, the war might be prolonged merely for the lust of conquest, and the loudest cheer of the meeting was raised by Mr. Henderson's demand for the destruction of "militarism not only in Germany but universally" Mr. Havelock Wilson moved the rejection of the memorandum, but this motion was defeated by 343 votes to 12.

Shortly before Christmas, both Mr. Balfour and the Prime Minister made speeches on Britain's war-aims. On the debate on the Appropriation Bill a demand was made from among some of the more moderate Liberals for a new statement of the war-aims of the Allies. This demand was also supported by Mr. Ponsonby, one of the extreme pacifists who inveighed against secret diplomacy and cast the blame of the withdrawal of Russia from the war upon the British Government alone. He charged the Government with having prostituted the disinterested motives for which this country had entered the war to a mean craving for vengeance and an arrogant demand for imperial aggrandisement. Mr Balfour in replying referred his critics to the statement of policy which he had made on behalf of the Government in his despatch to our ambassador in Washington nearly a year ago, and declared that that statement remained, and put in broad outlines the objects for which Britain was fighting. He said that there was no possible foundation for the statement that it was the blundering of the War Office or Cabinet which had prevented Russia from being whole-heartedly on the side of the Allies. As for a conference on war-aims, none had ever been refused, and Mr. Balfour repeated that we had stated our war-aims clearly, but the Central Powers had never stated theirs at all. The only speaker in the rest of the debate from the front opposition bench was Mr. Runciman, who agreed that we were entitled to use the economic weapon during the war, but declared that it would be of no use if we said to Germany that we were going to make use of the blockade against her for all time. Lord Robert Cecil wound up the debate for the Government with two striking declarations. He stated that neither he nor any other member of the Government advocated an economic war after the war, and that he would not remain for an hour a member of a Government which

did not make one of its main objects an arrangement for a League of Nations after the war. On the following day the Prime Minister addressed the House before its adjournment for the Christmas Recess. He began by warning food retailers that if they did not prevent the existing discomfort arising from queues the Government might have to take upon itself the distribution of the necessaries of life. He took an optimistic view of the shipping position, and turning to the military situation he attributed disappointments of hopes for the current year entirely to the Russian collapse. Still, the Germans had been beaten on the West in many battles, and had had only one conspicuous success, probably attributable to a surprise which was now the subject of an inquiry. The balance had, however, been redressed by the capture of Baghdad and Jerusalem which had added more to the prestige of Britain than almost any event in the whole course of the war. The Prime Minister warned the House that as a result of the unexpected defeat in Italy and the defection of Russia, it was necessary that the country should make greater sacrifices in order to strengthen the armies in the field during the coming year, and it was therefore necessary that the pledges given to labour in relation to recruiting should either be altered or cancelled.

A striking change in the command of the Navy was announced by the Secretary of the Admiralty on December 26, when Vice-Admiral Sir Rosslyn Wemyss, K.C.B., had been appointed First Sea Lord in succession to Admiral Sir John Jellicoe. Sir Rosslyn Wemyss as a Rear-Admiral was in command of a squadron at the landing at Gallipoli, and was also present at the evacuation. He received the K.C.B. in January, 1916, and in the following December was promoted Vice-Admiral. On August 7, 1917, he was appointed Second Sea Lord.

The year thus ended with the objects of the Allies still unrealised. The fact that Russia had withdrawn, while America had not yet come in as regards the military campaign, rendered the prospect for the coming year still harder than it had been for the year just past. Nevertheless the British people remained as fully determined as before, not to abandon the fight until they had achieved the objects for which they had entered it.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

I. FRANCE.

THE political situation in France at the opening of the year presented some interesting and significant features. The life and thought of the country were, of course, completely dominated by the war; and from the outbreak of the conflict up to December, 1916, the French people had displayed an absolute unanimity of opinion on the great and terrible problems which confronted them. The Austro-German offer of peace at the end of 1916 caused, however, a small break in this remarkable unanimity. An important section of the Socialist Party disapproved of the categorical and uncompromising refusal which the French Government, and the French Government's Allies, returned to this declaration of the enemy. These dissentients held that the Entente Powers ought to have asked the German Government to state more precisely the terms upon which they were prepared to enter into negotiations, and that it was a mistake to reject the offer without a more prolonged and more careful consideration. Some Socialist bodies also passed resolutions averring that, the German suggestions having been ascertained, these ought to be submitted to the French and other Entente Parliaments, and ought not to be dealt with by the Governments without such consultation.

It was the line of cleavage produced in this way in December, 1916, which gave rise to the most important controversies in 1917. There was every indication that in January the Government had the strong support of a large majority of the nation in their attitude towards foreign policy, but as time went by the strength of the dissident section appeared to be growing.

The first Parliamentary move by the newly formed Socialist Opposition took place on January 19. In the Chamber of Deputies on that day M. Pressemare proposed a motion asking "leave to interpellate" the Government on the points raised by the French replies to the proposals of the German and American Executives. In opposing the motion, M. Briand, the Prime Minister, stated that in his opinion the force of the reply to Mr. Wilson would be weakened by any debate upon its

details in Parliament. The motion was defeated by 437 votes to 57, but the extreme Socialists found comfort in the fact that in the past similar resolutions had been carried unanimously, or with only one, two, or three dissentients.

During March a political crisis arose, and was followed by one of those changes of Government which have been so common in the Third Republic, and which turn on personal questions, the mere executive efficiency of individuals, and do not involve any important changes in the principle of policy. The crisis arose over the enforced resignation of General Lyautey, the War Minister, on March 14. The General was an honest politician, who had carried through an important "man-power" Bill at the beginning of the year (involving the re-examination of hundreds of thousands of medically rejected recruits), but he was altogether lacking in tact and had made himself obnoxious to many sections of the Chamber, and especially to the Socialists. M. Briand found himself unable to reconstitute his Cabinet, and three days later he handed in his own resignation to M. Poincaré, the President. M. Briand had been Premier for nearly eighteen months—since October, 1915—and it should be added that before the war he had also served a term of office as Prime Minister.

M. Poincaré, acting in accordance with the Constitutional practice, entered into consultation with the respective Chairmen of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, MM. Dubost and Deschanel, and then requested the latter statesman to form a Government. M. Deschanel felt obliged to decline this offer, however, and the President then sent for M. Ribot, who announced on March 19 that he had been able to form a Cabinet. The new Cabinet was composed as follows:—

Premier and Foreign Minister—M. Alexandre Ribot.
Minister of Justice—M. Viviani.
Minister of War—M. Poinlevé.
Minister of Marine—Admiral Lacaze.
Minister of Munitions—M. Thomas.
Minister of Finance—M. Thiersy.
Minister of the Interior—M. Malvy.
Minister of Education—M. Steeg.
Minister of Public Works—M. Desplas.
Minister of Commerce—M. Clémentel.
Minister of Agriculture—M. Fernand David.
Food Controller—M. Violette.
Minister of Labour—M. Léon Bourgeois.
Minister for the Colonies—M. Magnot.

The new Premier was at this time 75 years of age. He was experienced in Foreign Policy, and was also regarded as an expert in finance. He was Foreign Minister at the time of the formation of the Dual Alliance, and since August, 1914, he had been Finance Minister, his position in that office being unaffected when M. Briand succeeded M. Viviani as Prime Minister. M. Ribot had twice been Prime Minister for short periods in the 'nineties, and he held that position for one day in June, 1914.

The special "War Committee" of the Cabinet included M. Painlevé, M. Thomas, Admiral Lacaze, M. Thierry, M. Maginot, and of course, the Premier himself. M. Maginot had risen very suddenly to this eminence, as he had never previously been a Cabinet Minister.

On March 21 M. Ribot made his statement of policy to the Lower Chamber, and declared that the aims of France were "to recover the provinces torn from us in the past, to obtain the reparation and guarantees due to France, and to prepare a durable peace based on respect for the rights and liberty of peoples." Referring to current events in Russia, he stated that in France they all hoped that the struggle to develop parliamentary institutions in Russia would terminate successfully and without bloodshed. The Government's declaration of policy was well received by the House.

During the next two months there were no important developments in politics, the mind of the country being exclusively concentrated upon the military operations. The failure of the French offensive in Champagne in April naturally caused the keenest disappointment in Paris, although it was realised that the Russian Revolution had greatly facilitated a successful German defence in the West. At the end of May the political issues raised by the war again came into prominence. In Russia the dominant section of the revolutionary politicians, that is to say, the more moderate wing of the Socialists, had brought about certain important modifications in that country's war-aims, and it became necessary to define France's attitude towards these modifications. Also, the Socialists debated hotly the proposal which had been made by the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee of the so-called "Socialist International" to hold an international peace conference of Socialists at Stockholm later in the summer. These two subjects were not altogether unrelated. On May 22 M. Ribot made a long speech in the Chamber of Deputies, in which he endeavoured to prove, not very convincingly, that no important differences of opinion existed between the new Russia and the other allied Powers. He referred especially to the Russian formula that peace ought to be concluded with "no annexations and no indemnities." M. Ribot said that the enforced restoration of the provinces formerly torn from France could not be rightly regarded as an annexation, but that there would be no question of a war-indemnity imposed upon the vanquished as a fine.

The French Premier displayed no real approximation to the views of the Russian Government, but on the other hand the Socialists warmly welcomed the numerous proclamations of the Revolutionary Cabinet.

At the end of May and during June the attention of the country was largely concentrated upon the invitation which the above-mentioned neutral committee and the Russian Socialists had sent to French and other Socialists asking them to attend

a great Socialist peace conference in Stockholm. At the end of May a conference of the National Council of the Socialist Party was held in order to consider this question. Speeches were made by the Socialist Deputies MM. Cachin and Moutet describing the state of opinion in Russia, whence they had just returned. The Russian plan was to hold a preliminary meeting at Stockholm at which the Socialist parties of the different nations could inform the neutral committee of their respective attitudes towards peace conditions, and at which the preparations for a general meeting (also in Stockholm) of the full "Internationale" could be made. The minority of the French Socialists (*i.e.* that section who had disapproved of the summary rejection of the German peace-offer in December) had been in favour of the Stockholm Conference ever since it was first suggested. The minority were led by M. Longuet. The congress was greatly influenced by the statements of MM. Cachin and Moutet, and on May 29 a resolution was proposed by M. Renaudel, official leader of the whole Socialist Party and actual leader of the majority, welcoming the Russian proposition, and agreeing to send delegates to the preliminary conference, who should have power to make arrangements with the Russians regarding the convocation of the full "Internationale." The resolution was passed unanimously.

This decision of the Socialist Council caused great excitement all over the country, and was condemned by nearly all non-Socialists. At a session of the Chamber of Deputies on June 1, M. Ribot announced that the Government would refuse to grant the Socialists passports to Stockholm. The Premier stated that in his opinion peace could only come through victory, and he held that it would be wrong for French Socialists under existing conditions to meet enemy Socialists. On June 1 to 4 a secret session of the Chamber of Deputies was held in order to hear the report of the Socialists recently returned from Russia. The Chamber was reported to have discussed a wide field of politics, including Franco-Russian diplomatic agreements and French war-aims. At the end of the secret session the Chamber passed a resolution by 453 votes to 52 declaring the determination of France to reconquer Alsace-Lorraine, and expressing confidence in the Government. The minority consisted almost exclusively of the Minority Socialists, but included also MM. Cachin and Moutet (who were Majority Socialists) and a few Radicals. The minority expressed fears that the refusal of passports and M. Ribot's speeches would make an unfortunate impression in Russia. On June 6 the Prime Minister made a speech on the same subject in the Senate, and after a secret sitting had been held, a resolution on the same lines as that adopted by the Chamber of Deputies was proposed, and was passed unanimously.

Although the French Socialists were thus unable to send delegates to Stockholm, they took the opportunity to define

their attitude towards peace conditions by answering the series of questions put by the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee who were attempting to organise the conference. On the question of Alsace-Lorraine the Socialists stated that, in order to be faithful to the principle that peoples had the right to decide their own destinies, they were ready to agree that the fate of the Province should be decided by a plebiscite of the inhabitants, the referendum to take place under international guarantees. This expression of opinion was very significant, since a precisely similar declaration was made by the Independent Socialists of Germany, and thus it came about that as between the extreme Left in Germany and the extreme Left in France there no longer existed any serious conflict of aims.

On July 31 M Ribot made a speech in the Chamber of Deputies replying to a speech delivered three days earlier by the new German Chancellor, Herr Michaelis. By some unexplained means the Chancellor had become acquainted with the information that the French Government had given to the Chamber during the secret session at the beginning of June, and he had denounced the French war-aims as aggressive, in that an agreement had been concluded with the Tsar by which German territory west of the Rhine, other than Alsace-Lorraine—the territory including Cologne, Bonn, and Coblenz—was to be severed from the German Empire and established as an autonomous state—a plan which the Chancellor described as thinly-veiled annexation (see Germany, p 220). M Ribot did not deny that an agreement to this effect had been made with the Tsar in February, 1917, but he emphasised the point that there was no intention whatever of annexing this territory to France. The scheme was to establish this part¹ of Germany as an autonomous state, in order to protect France and Belgium against invasion from across the Rhine.

Two days later a debate on the general policy of the Government took place in the Chamber, and a vote of confidence was passed by 392 votes to 61, the minority consisting of the Socialists, who were dissatisfied with the Ministry's attitude towards the Russian peace programme.

The financial position of the country grew more and more deplorable. The war credits which had been voted up to December 31, 1916, amounted in the aggregate to 2,440,000,000/. The national debt before the war had amounted to 1,315,000,000/, so that France began this year with a burden of indebtedness amounting to nearly four milliards sterling. The rate of expenditure continued to increase, and the war credits voted in 1917 amounted to 1,660,000,000/, the total thus reaching 4,100,000,000/, exclusive of the pre-war debt. Only a very small part of the war expenditure had been met out of revenue, and the French had been unable to raise by war loans any sum

¹ It appears, however, that the scheme provided for the annexation to France of the small but important coal district of the River Saar (see Russia, p 257).

approaching what was required. Two loans had been issued, one in 1915 and the other in 1916, but the aggregate subscriptions to these had reached only 1,065,000,000. Large sums were constantly raised, however, by short-term loans.

At the beginning of September a new Cabinet crisis arose, and on the 7th of that month M. Ribot's Government resigned. The Ministry had been attacked on the one side by the Socialists, for the reasons already stated, and on the other side by the various groups which considered that the Government had been lacking in vigour in suppressing treasonable intrigue in the country. The Minister of the Interior, M. Malvy, was the particular object of these latter accusations, and his resignation was tendered several days before that of the remainder of the Cabinet.

M. Poincaré entrusted M. Painlevé with the formation of a Ministry, and the personnel, which was announced on September 13, was as follows:—

Prime Minister and War Minister—M. Painlevé.
Minister of Justice—M. R. Péret.
Minister for Foreign Affairs—M. Ribot.
Minister of the Interior—M. Steeg.
Minister of Marine—M. Chaumet.
Minister of Munitions—M. Loucheur.
Minister of Finance—M. Klotz.
Minister for the Colonies—M. R. Besnard.
Minister of Public Works—M. Glaveille.
Minister of Public Instruction—M. D. Vincent.
Minister of Labour—M. Renard.
Minister of Commerce—M. Clémentel.
Minister of Agriculture—M. David.
Fool Controller—M. M. Long.
Minister for Foreign Missions—M. Franklin-Bouillon.
Secretaries of State—MM. Barthou, Léon Bourgeois, Doumer, and Depuy.

The special "war-committee" of the Cabinet was composed of the Ministers of War, Marine, Munitions, Foreign Affairs, and the four "Secretaries of State."

No Socialists were included in this Ministry, in spite of M. Painlevé's efforts at conciliation, and that party adopted a critical, if not an actually hostile attitude. A small section of the Radical-Socialist Party, the followers of M. Caillaux, also declared against the new Cabinet. On September 18 the new Prime Minister made a formal statement of policy to the Chamber of Deputies. He declared that all the efforts of the Government would be concentrated on the war, and that any anti-patriotic propaganda would be put down with a strong hand. The aims of France were, said the Premier, the disannexation of Alsace-Lorraine, and the securing from the enemy of just reparation and guarantees. The speech was very long, and was received with wide satisfaction. A general debate ensued, and on the following day a motion approving the Government's declaration was passed by 378 votes to 1, the Socialists abstaining.

The Painlevé Ministry had a very short and very stormy

existence. It was nearly overthrown in October. The question of war-aims was coming more and more to the front in political discussions, and the antagonism between the Right and the Socialists steadily increased. Speaking in the Chamber of Deputies on October 19, M. Painlevé reiterated France's demand for the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine, and said: "When I was in London, Herr von Kuhlmann said that not an inch of German territory would be yielded. That was a challenge with regard to Alsace-Lorraine. Mr Lloyd George, for the first time, formally replied to Herr von Kuhlmann by another, a noble, challenge, saying that Great Britain would stand by France until France had disannexed Alsace-Lorraine. The day after, the United States made the same declaration."

In the middle of October it became known that a semi-official German peace-offer had been made indirectly, proceeding apparently through Prince Bulow to M. Briand. The offer was said to have included important concessions to the Western Powers—the evacuation of Belgium and of France, a willingness to discuss Alsace-Lorraine,¹ and the cession of Trieste to Italy—but the Central Powers expected to gain advantages in the East. M. Ribot, on being acquainted with the offer, recognised it as a "trap." On October 16 the Lower Chamber heard a statement on this matter from M. Ribot in secret session, and the explanation was deemed so unsatisfactory by the Left that in the vote of confidence which followed about 200 deputies abstained. M. Ribot thereupon resigned, and M. Barthou was appointed Foreign Minister. On October 25, M. Barthou made a statement in the Lower Chamber, demanding the unconditional return of Alsace-Lorraine, and declaring that even among Socialists, some admitted that France could justly claim, by way of guarantees, the neutralisation of certain territories. He encountered the opposition of the Socialists, who were almost as dissatisfied with this statement as they had been with M. Ribot's policy.

On November 13 the Government were defeated in the Chamber of Deputies on a vote of confidence by 279 votes to 186. The Chamber was dissatisfied with the Government's treatment of the question of the supreme army command, many deputies desiring a single (French) commander-in-chief for all the Western Allies, and also with the laxity of the Administration in dealing with alleged pro-German propaganda.

A Cabinet was then formed by M. Clemenceau, the personnel being as follows:—

Prime Minister and Minister of War—M. Clemenceau
Minister of Justice—M. Nail
Minister of Foreign Affairs—M. Pichon.
Minister of Finance—M. Klotz.
Minister of the Interior—M. Pams
Minister of Marine—M. G. Leygues

¹ It was stated at first that there had been a definite offer to restore Alsace-Lorraine, but this was subsequently denied.

Minister of Commerce—M. Clémentel
Minister of Public Works—M. Claveille
Minister of Munitions—M. Loucheur
Minister of Public Instruction—M. Lafferre.
Minister for the Colonies—M. H. Simon
Minister of Labour—M. Collard
Minister of the Blockade—M. Jounart.
Minister of Agriculture (and Supplies)—M. Boët.

M. Georges Clemenceau was born in 1841, had been Prime Minister at the time of the Casablanca incident in 1908, and had always been a strong supporter of the Entente policy. He was regarded by his friends as a determined statesman, and as likely to make an admirable War Premier, representing a vigorous prosecution of the war. The new Ministry was strongly opposed by the Socialists, who now appeared to have gone into permanent opposition. On November 20 M. Clemenceau read his declaration of policy to the Chamber of Deputies. The sentiments and ideas expressed were full of patriotic enthusiasm. The Premier declared that his aim was to carry on the "war and nothing but the war" Pacifist propaganda would be dealt with by courts-martial. There should be "no more pacifist campaigns; no more German intrigues. Neither treason, nor half-treason. War, nothing but War" Then the Premier referred to President Wilson's policy of a "League of Nations." He said that "the Socialists appeared to believe that a league of nations would come from a miracle overnight. He did not believe in miracles, and even if a league of nations were formed, he would not have Germany in it" As for the Government's war-aims, they were, he said, simply "to conquer." The vote of confidence in the new Ministry was passed by 418 votes to 65.

Throughout the last six months of the year French public life was much perturbed by talk of treasonable plots. Up to the end of the year much mystery surrounded many of the incidents. Early in August raids were made upon several extreme pacifist journals in Paris, including the *Bonnet Rouge*, of which M. Miguel Almeyreda was editor. M. Almeyreda himself was arrested, and a few days later he died in prison under most mysterious circumstances. That his death was not from natural causes was certain, but whether he committed suicide or how he actually died was not known. Almeyreda had had an acquaintanceship of some kind with M. Malvy, and it was this fact, in the main, which caused the latter's resignation. Other persons who were implicated and arrested were Bolo Pasha, M. Turmel (a member of the Lower Chamber), and M. Duval, Manager of the *Bonnet Rouge*. M. Daudet, editor of the Royalist *Action Française* accused M. Malvy of high treason. The climax was reached, however, when, after M. Clemenceau had come into power, the same accusation was made against M. Caillaux himself. The cases of M. Malvy and M. Caillaux were still *sub judice* at the end of the year, but the

fact of a charge of this kind being made against M. Caillaux, an ex-Premier of France, naturally caused a great stir in the country. A strong *prima-facie* case existed against Almeyreda, Bolo, Duval, and Turmel, for they were found in possession of mysterious foreign cheques.

Notwithstanding minor differences of opinion, the end of the year found the French people wholly and unalterably determined to carry on the war to a victorious conclusion.

II ITALY.

At the opening of the year the political situation in Italy was essentially the same as it had been since the country entered the European War in May, 1915. All the "Central" political parties, with the support, to all appearances, of a considerable majority of the nation, were united in their desire to see the war actively prosecuted. On the other hand, on the extreme Left of political life, the Official Socialists remained avowedly and actively hostile to the Government's foreign policy, and on the Right wing certain Conservative and Clerical cliques, including some of the nobility, maintained their attitude of silent disapproval. Italy was the only belligerent State in Europe in which the masses of the nation were, as a whole, more strongly in favour of a war-policy than were the upper classes: the reverse was true of all the other countries involved.

Italy had been fortunate in escaping the experience of an Austro-German invasion of her own territory, but in some other respects her position was worse than that of any other Entente Power. The country's financial position was very grave, so grave, indeed, that it was hopeless for the Italian Government to think of meeting the difficulties without foreign aid. Italy had not joined the war until nearly ten months after its commencement, and her expenditure had been less than that of any other great Power, but it must be remembered that the country was, even before the war, very poor, its financial resources being smaller than those of Russia or even Austria-Hungary. The total Italian war expenditure up to March 31, 1917, was 730,000,000*l.*, the average expenditure thus being slightly over 30,000,000*l.* per month. Now the pre-war debt of the country was 580,000,000*l.*, so that the aggregate indebtedness at the end of March was no less than 1,310,000,000*l.* The subscriptions to the war-loans which had been issued up to the end of 1916 amounted to only 210,000,000*l.* Another war-loan, known as the Third Loan,¹ was issued in February. The price of issue was 90, as against 97½ for the Second Loan (1916), and the rate of interest was 5 per cent., the same as in the case of the Second Loan. The loan was open for subscriptions from February 5

¹ It was really the fourth. A loan for "military preparations," which was issued early in 1915, was for all practical purposes a war-loan, though it could not be so named, since Italy had not then declared war.

to February 25, and the subscriptions received amounted to 144,000,000*l.* Thus up to the end of March the kingdom had met slightly less than half its war expenditure from its own loans. On the other hand, the Government had wisely imposed new taxation, and the revenue for the financial year ending June 30, 1917, reached the remarkable sum of 165,000,000*l.*, which represented an increase of about 45,000,000*l.* on the figures for the previous year. The revenue thus exceeded the non-military expenditure by over 80,000,000*l.*, since Italy's expenditure, apart from that upon military and naval purposes, amounted to only about 80,000,000*l.* The rate of the war expenditure steadily increased, however, and by the end of March it had reached an average of nearly 50,000,000*l.* per month. This continued, and the total expenditure up to September 30 was almost exactly one milliard sterling. Italy received financial assistance on a very large scale from Great Britain and the United States.

The Russian Revolution and the fundamental change which this caused in Muscovite foreign policy placed the Italian Government in the same difficult position in which the French and British Ministries found themselves. Indeed, the new Russian formula of peace with "No Annexations and no Indemnities" could not be accepted by Italy without modification, since one of their objects in entering the war was a settlement of the question of "Italia Irredenta." On the one hand, the Government were anxious to avoid offending a great and still potentially formidable ally, and on the other hand they could not be expected to abjure the very aims for which they and the parties which supported them had gone to war, and for the attainment of which many thousands of Italians had given their lives. Early in the summer, therefore, the Government sent a group of Radical members of the Lower House to Petrograd, in the hope that these politicians would be able to convince the Provisional Government and the new Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates of the justice of Italy's war-aims. The mission consisted of representatives of the Republican and Reformist-Socialist parties, politicians who held "advanced" views on internal politics, but who were strongly pro-war. No member of the Official Socialist Party was sent, for this party agreed with the new Russian policy, not with the Italian Government, and would therefore, of course, have been worse than useless from the point of view of converting the Russians. The mission had little or no effect upon opinion in Russia, since the Russian Socialists were, of course, aware of the existence of the Italian Official Socialists, and they therefore criticised the mission as unrepresentative of Italian democracy.

Early in June the Official Socialist Party decided to send delegates to the proposed Stockholm Peace Conference of Socialists, but the Italian Government, acting in accord with the French and British Governments, refused to give passports

for this purpose. The Socialists considered that this action tended to accentuate the schism between Russia and Italy, the dominant parties in Russia being strongly in favour of the conference.

During June the Radicals, Republicans, and Reformist-Socialists directed somewhat severe criticism against the Cabinet, and more particularly against the Minister of the Interior, Signor Orlando, who was accused of permitting the Official Socialists to carry on active propaganda in favour of peace. Signor Boselli, the Prime Minister, was able to disregard the criticisms of himself, for he had the warm allegiance of the Liberals, but he felt it desirable to make several alterations in the personnel of his Cabinet. The Minister for War resigned, and his place was taken by General G. Giardino, and several other changes were made.

On June 20 Baron Sonnino, the Foreign Minister, made an important speech in the Chamber of Deputies, and dealt more particularly with the proclamation announcing an Italian protectorate over Albania which the Government had recently caused to be issued by the Commander of the Italian troops in that principality (see *Albania*.) "Italy," said the Minister, "has no other object in regard to Albania than to defend it against any possible interference or intrigues on the part of a third Power. Italy will guarantee to Albania the full right to dispose of herself as regards internal affairs, and will support her legitimate rights and interests in the national assembly. The Powers meeting to discuss the peace treaty will have the general task of determining the precise boundaries of the state of Albania." Referring to the Russian proposals for peace, Baron Sonnino said that the negative formula "No Annexations and no Indemnities" was unsatisfactory if separated from positive conceptions of the liberty and independence of nations, and the annulment of the results of past aggressions.

After this a series of secret sessions of the Chamber took place, and in the debates which then ensued important speeches were delivered by Signor Orlando, who undoubtedly strengthened his position by the explanations and revelations which he was able to make. The public session was resumed on June 30 and the Chamber passed a vote of confidence in the Ministry by 361 votes to 63.

The Pope's Note to the belligerent Governments urging them to conclude peace (see *Rome*) had a very mixed reception in Italy, and all the indications were that the majority of the people were hostile to the suggestions made by the Pontiff. The comments of politicians and newspapers followed the party lines, and were such as might have been anticipated. Most of the newspapers, whether Conservative, Liberal, Radical, or Reformist-Socialist, accused the Pope of Austrophil sentiments, and declared that he failed to appreciate the high moral

cause for which the Entente were fighting. Much resentment was caused by the fact that the Note addressed the two groups of belligerents as being on the same moral level. On the other hand the Note was received with enthusiasm by the Official Socialists, and naturally, also, with favour by the Clerical press. Moreover, the Pope's move was praised by the Conservative "neutralist" group. The *Stampa* of Turin, the organ representing Signor Giolitti, the Conservative leader who had been in retirement since the outbreak of war, expressed sentiments so very favourable to the Pope that many of these comments were struck out by the Government's censor.

At the end of October a Cabinet crisis arose. This did not signify any change in the general policy of the parliamentary majority, nor was it directly connected with the great Italian defeat on the Isonzo, although the Italian retreat was taking place at the same time. It was caused by a general dissatisfaction with the Government's methods of administration. In particular, the Cabinet was accused of mismanaging the problem of food supplies, and many parts of the country were suffering from scarcity. Food riots had occurred at Turin. No feeling existed against Signor Boselli personally, but on October 25 the Chamber of Deputies expressed its dissatisfaction by rejecting a vote of confidence in the Government by 314 votes to 96. The King took counsel with Signor Boselli, Signor Marcora (President of the Chamber of Deputies), and Signor Manfredi (President of the Senate), and then requested Signor Orlando to form a Cabinet. That statesman accepted the invitation, and he found immediately that he was widely supported by the political parties. The Ministry thus formed included the following statesmen.—

Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior—Signor Orlando.
Minister for Foreign Affairs—Baron Sonnino.
Minister of Finance—Signor Meda.
Minister for the Colonies—Signor Colosimo.
Minister of Justice—Signor Sacchi.
Minister of the Treasury—Signor Nitti.
Minister of War—General Alfieri.
Minister of Marine—Admiral del Buono.
Minister of Munitions—General Dall' Olio.
Minister of Pensions—Signor Bissolati.
Minister of Education—Signor Berenini.
Minister of Public Works—Signor Dari.
Minister of Agriculture—Signor Miliani.
Minister of Industry and Labour—Signor Giuffelli.
Minister of Posts—Signor Fera.
Minister of Transport—Signor Bianchi.

Signor Vittorio Emmanuele Orlando was born at Palermo in 1860. He had had a distinguished career as a scholar, and had occupied several important Ministerial appointments, the latest being, as previously mentioned, that of Minister of the Interior. Owing to the serious position at the front, there was a general tendency to rally round the Government, and when he met Parliament, Signor Orlando found that he had the sup-

port, more or less enthusiastic, of all the parties except the Official Socialists.

A speech describing the general Policy of the Government was delivered by Signor Orlando in the Lower Chamber on November 14. He pointed out the extreme gravity of the situation caused by the recent Austro-German advance, but said that the Italians would unite in offering a vigorous resistance to the invaders. The decision to create a supreme Inter-Allied Council should, he said, serve to strengthen the strategy of the three Western Powers. On this day Signor Giolitti reappeared in the Chamber, and made a non-committal speech. All Italians should, he said, be actuated by patriotic sentiments in such a crisis, but the responsibility for events rested upon the Government alone.

On December 22 Signor Orlando made a speech in the Chamber of Deputies condemning the policy of the Official Socialists and of the Russian Bolsheviks. A general Socialist peace was, he said, impracticable, since to secure it, all the armies would have to leave the trenches simultaneously, and declare themselves revolutionaries. He could have understood the Bolsheviks meeting Liebknecht or Haase, but instead of this, they had negotiated with German generals. The Socialists had pretended that a peace could be secured on *status quo* terms, but the Central Powers had never spoken of such a peace. Germany had never offered to restore Belgium, and Austria had manifested no intention of returning the district of Italy which she had invaded. After this speech a vote of confidence was passed by 345 votes to 50.

THE SEE OF ROME

Mention must be made here of the part played by the Roman Catholic Church in the political and diplomatic affairs of Europe during the year. The national Churches in the several belligerent states had, in regard to the war, identified themselves with the policies of the states to which they respectively belonged. The only exceptions were the small bodies which were opposed on principle to all war, no matter what the circumstances. Despite the fact that the Church of Rome was, of course, an international organisation, even the Roman ecclesiastics, as individuals, identified themselves in most cases with the countries in which they were domiciled. The Roman Church was, however, officially neutral, and was officially in favour of the re-establishment of peace by conference and compromise. The Vatican made no very vigorous attempts to use its international organisation for the purpose of bringing about the peace which it desired; but in August the Pope sent an appeal to the heads of all the belligerent states, urging them to seek peace, and describing, in considerable detail, the terms for a settlement which seemed to the Church to be just.

The note began by stating that the Pontiff had aimed at preserving perfect impartiality and had desired to lose no opportunity of bringing the belligerent Governments to more moderate counsels, and thus to secure peace. The Pope recalled his peace note of 1915, and said that he had made other efforts in the same direction, which had not been made public. He described the miseries of the conflict and continued: "And now none can imagine how the sufferings of all would be increased and intensified were yet other months, or still worse, other years, added to this bloody triennium. Shall, then, the civilised world be nought but a field of death? And shall Europe, so glorious and flourishing, rush, as though driven by universal madness, towards the abyss, and lend her hand to her own suicide."

The Pope stated that he "heeded neither the suggestions nor the interests of either of the belligerent parties," but felt called upon to urge peace upon the belligerent Governments once more, and on this occasion to suggest concrete terms. The terms were set out at length, and included: (1) Reciprocal reduction of armaments. (2) Arbitration in international disputes, with concerted pressure against any state refusing to accept arbitration. (3) Freedom of the seas. (4) Reciprocal condonation of damage done by invasion (5) Evacuation of Belgium, and restoration of her "complete political, military, and economic independence towards all Powers whatsoever" (6) Evacuation of France (7) Restoration of German Colonies (8) In regard to disputed territorial questions—Alsace-Lorraine, Trentino, etc.—the recommendations were vague, but it was suggested that the aspirations of the populations actually concerned should be gratified, so far as might be practicable. It was especially mentioned that the same principle should be applied to "the territories forming part of the ancient Kingdom of Poland."

In conclusion the Pope reminded the heads of the states of their enormous responsibility, and urged them to accept his proposals.

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

I. GERMANY.

THE German Empire, after twenty-nine months of war, was battered and bleeding from many wounds, but still held a position of great strength. The wearisome pressure of the British Fleet had compelled the greater part of the population to subsist upon an insufficient diet, which had undermined the health and energy of the nation, and the Imperial armies had suffered

4,000,000 casualties, of which total the killed constituted about a third. But in a military sense the course of the war had remained favourable to the Hohenzollern Empire, every army which had approached Germany or her chief ally, Austria-Hungary—the Russians, the French, the British, the Italians, the Rumanians—had still remained outside her frontiers, and save for small districts of Austria, around Gorizia and Czernovitz respectively, and a still smaller section of German territory in Alsace, the league of enemies occupied no European territory of the Central Empires, whereas on the other hand vast regions of the Entente countries, both east and west, had been seized by the armies of the two Kaisers. German military prestige had, indeed, suffered somewhat from the Russian victories in Volhynia and Bukovina in the summer of 1916; but it had been rehabilitated by the capture of Bukarest in the autumn.

The year 1916 closed, as the reader will remember, with a definite and official offer on the part of Germany and her allies to enter into immediate peace negotiations. This offer was categorically rejected by the Entente Governments; and this refusal, coupled with the Entente's reply to the American President's peace note (see English History, p. 211), in which the Allied Powers proclaimed their intentions, had the effect in German internal politics of strengthening the position of the Emperor's Government. The German people regarded the proclaimed aims of their enemies as aggressive, in spite of the statement in the Entente Note that the integrity and the liberty of German-speaking peoples were not menaced; and hence they were willing to continue to suffer in a war which they deemed defensive, for it must not be forgotten that distorted ideas of the intentions of the Allies continued to be spread throughout Germany.

The diplomatic events of December, 1916, had another effect on the German political situation, besides that of greatly reducing the internal opposition to the war. The political parties had retained throughout these years of war their separate organisations, but they were in fact grouped through their respective attitudes towards war-policy into three informal parties, the divisions between which cut across the lines which separated statesmen before the war. These three parties may be termed the chauvinists, the moderates, and the internationalists. The chauvinists comprised the Conservatives and the National Liberals. The moderates included the Catholics (or "Centre" Party), the Radicals, and that section of the Social Democrats whose views were represented by the majority of the Socialist members of the Reichstag. The internationalists consisted of the extreme Left wing of the Socialist Party. Only a small minority of the Socialist members of the Lower House adhered to this last section, but there existed indications that the internationalists were relatively stronger in the electorate than they were in Parliament.

Now Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of the German Empire and Prime Minister of Prussia, was an unscrupulous opportunist, rather than a fanatical and enthusiastic advocate of Pan-Germanism. That he cared nothing, as a matter of principle, for the rights of other nations, the villainous treatment of Belgium—for which he as much as any man was responsible—proved beyond all doubt. But not being an enthusiast, he had never been blind to the realities of the situation, and had never failed to perceive the awkward character of the net into which he had led his country when he involved her in war with several Great Powers simultaneously. He had consequently always eschewed extravagant schemes of conquest. And from the Battle of the Marne onwards till December, 1916, the Chancellor had been searching about for some means of extricating Germany, without serious loss of power or credit, from a conflict which he regarded as an unfortunate entanglement rather than as an opportunity for Imperial expansion. Thus it came about that the Imperial Ministers looked to the moderates in the Reichstag for support. It is to be feared that amongst the Centre Party and the Radicals, both in Parliament and in the country, there were few who had really conscientious objections to a policy of conquest, but these parties were composed of men who, like the Chancellor, took the short and practical view that it was desirable to terminate the war as quickly as possible by means of a compromise with the enemy. The so-called Majority Socialists were also in favour of a peace by compromise, but in their case there was undoubtedly more sincerity, and less mere opportunism, in their claim that they had no wish to curtail the rights of other nations.

The attitude of the chauvinists was far different. They were feverishly anxious to prosecute the war to a definite German victory, in the possibility of which they had never ceased to believe, and to continue till a "German peace" could be secured. The expression a "German peace," as distinct from what was called "a reasonable peace," implied great and ruthless annexations of territory, both east and west, and involved in practice the establishment of a German hegemony in Europe. It is doubtful whether these chauvinists were really much more unscrupulous than the Government and their supporters—other than the Majority Socialists—and it might be contended on their behalf that they were at least more honest in their dishonesty than was the Chancellor.

A further vitally important difference between the chauvinists and the moderates was that the former advocated a ruthless extension of submarine warfare, without regard to the opinions, wishes, or threats of the United States Government.

Herr von Jagow, who had been Foreign Minister throughout the war up to November, 1916, was a more cautious, and probably more honest statesman than the Chancellor, and it was mainly through his efforts that war with the United

States was avoided in May, 1916, after the *Sussex* incident. Herr von Jagow had worked for an understanding with Great Britain before the war, and after the storm broke he had appreciated the importance for Germany, both materially and morally, of maintaining friendship with at least one great civilised Power, and hence his resignation in November signalled a change of policy which could hardly fail to be unfortunate for Europe, for the world, and also for Germany. He was succeeded by Herr Zimmermann, previously Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, a man whose first actions were not indicative of any outstanding ability. The new policy was to attempt to obtain peace immediately by compromise with the hostile Powers ; and then, if peace proved unobtainable in this way, to throw away all scruples and all fears, and, recking nothing of the consequences, to wage war with the new submarine weapon in the most deadly manner possible.

The Austro-German peace offer having been rejected by the Entente, the German Government issued a Note to neutral countries on January 11 commenting on the international situation thus produced. This communication began by stating that owing to the character of the Entente reply, no further Note could be sent to the hostile Governments, but that the German Government considered it important to explain to neutral Powers its opinion about the situation. After referring briefly to the origin of the war, and stating that the defensive aims of the Central Powers might now be regarded as achieved, the Note proceeded : "On the other hand, the hostile Powers have been continually receding farther and farther from the accomplishment of their aims, which include, according to the declarations of their responsible statesmen, the conquest of Alsace-Lorraine and several Prussian provinces, the humiliation and diminution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, the partition of Turkey, and the mutilation of Bulgaria. In the face of such schemes as these, the demand of our enemies for 'restitution, reparation, and guarantees' sounds truly surprising." The statement of the Allies that the proposal of the Central Powers was merely a war manœuvre was, according to the Note, totally false. "They (the Central Powers) were persuaded that a peace which would be just and acceptable to all belligerents was possible, that it could be brought about by an immediate exchange of views at a conference, and that, therefore, the responsibility for further bloodshed could not be taken. Their readiness, affirmed without reservation, to make known their peace conditions at the initiation of negotiations, refutes every doubt as to their sincerity." The Note then proceeded to complain that the Entente had neither asked the Central Powers for some details of their peace proposals nor even made any counter-suggestions of their own. The Entente were further accused of hypocrisy in their support of the "principle of nationalities," owing to the conquest of the Boer Republics,

the subjugation of Northern Africa by Great Britain, France, and Italy, and the ruthless suppression of non-Russian nationalities in the Muscovite Empire; and, moreover, the violation of Greece was described as "without precedent in history"—an almost incredibly witless phrase in the mouth of the Government which had crushed neutral Belgium under its iron heel. Complaint was also made against the alleged violations of international law by Great Britain, and against the use of coloured troops in Europe, and "the extension of the war into Africa, which was a breach of existing treaties, and tends to undermine the prestige of the white race on that continent." The next paragraph was an attempt to answer the Allies' references to Belgium in their Note of December 30. "Twice the Imperial Government declared to the Belgian Government that it did not come as an enemy to Belgium, and asked it to spare the country the terrors of war. Germany in these circumstances offered to guarantee the integrity and independence of the kingdom and to pay full compensation for all damages which might be caused by the passage of German troops. It is known that the Royal British Government in 1887 was resolved not to oppose the use of the right-of-way through Belgium under these conditions. The Belgian Government declined the repeated offers of the Imperial Government." The German Government, it was declared, had made an honest attempt to obtain a just peace, and it was upon its adversaries that the responsibility for further bloodshed rested. "The four allied (Central) Powers, however, will continue the struggle in quiet confidence and with a firm trust in their good cause until a peace is gained which guarantees to their nations honour, existence, and liberty of development, and which will give to all the nations of the European Continent the blessing of working together in mutual respect and with equal rights for the solution of the great problems of life."

After the peace-move had failed, the German Government lost no time in taking the next step in the policy which it had now laid out for itself. On January 31, Herr Zimmermann presented a Note to Mr. Gerard, the United States Ambassador in Berlin, which withdrew the promise given after the *Sussex* incident and inaugurated the era of unrestricted attacks upon merchantmen by the German submarines. The Note was as follows:—

"Your Excellency was good enough on January 22 to communicate to me the message which the President of the United States delivered on the same day to the American Senate. The Imperial Government has taken cognisance of the contents of the message with the serious attention due to the President's utterances, which are inspired by a high sense of responsibility. It affords it (the Imperial Government) great satisfaction to declare that the guiding lines of this important declaration agree to a wide extent with the principles and wishes which

Germany professes. Among these principles the first place must be given to the right of all nations to self-government and equal rights. In acknowledging this principle Germany would sincerely rejoice if peoples like those of Ireland and India who do not enjoy the blessings of political independence, now obtained their freedom. Alliances which drive peoples to competition in power and entangle them in the net of selfish intrigues are rejected also by the German people. On the other hand, its joyful collaboration is assured to all efforts which aim at the prevention of future wars. The freedom of the seas as the preliminary condition of the free existence and peaceful intercourse of the peoples and the open door for trade by all nations have always been among the leading principles of German policy. On this account the Imperial Government regrets all the more deeply that the attitude of its enemies, which is so hostile to peace, renders it impossible for the world to begin at once to effect the realisation of these sublime aims. Germany and her allies were ready to enter forthwith into peace negotiations, and had declared as the basis of such negotiations, the existence, security, honour, and freedom of development of their several peoples. Their plans, as they expressly emphasised in the Note of December 12, 1916, were not aimed at the destruction or crushing of their enemies, but on the contrary, were, in their belief, quite compatible with the rights of other nations, more particularly those of Belgium, which is the object of the warm sympathy of the United States.

"A few weeks ago the Imperial Chancellor declared that Germany had never aimed at the annexation of Belgium. In the peace which was to have been concluded with Belgium, Germany only desired to take precautions that this country, with which the Imperial Government desires to live on good neighbourly terms, should not be used by the enemy for the promotion of hostile designs. Such a precaution is the more urgent in that the enemy rulers in successive speeches, and especially in the resolutions of the Paris Economic Conference, undisguisedly announced their intention not to recognise Germany as possessing equal rights, even after the re-establishment of peace, but to continue to fight systematically.

"The peace attempt of the four allies failed owing to the lust of conquest of their opponents, who desire to dictate peace. On the pretext of the principle of nationalities they disclosed their war-aim, which is to disintegrate and to dishonour Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria. To the desire for reconciliation they oppose the will to destruction. They desire to fight to the utmost. Thus a new situation has arisen, which accordingly forces Germany to make new decisions.

"For two and a half years England has misused her naval power in the wicked attempt to force Germany into submission by hunger. Brutally ignoring International Law, the group of Powers led by England not only prevent the legitimate com-

merce of their opponents but by ruthless pressure force neutral states also to abandon such commercial intercourse as happens not to be agreeable to them, or compel them to restrict their commerce according to arbitrary regulations.

"The American people know the efforts which were made to induce England and her allies to return to International Law, and to respect the law of the freedom of the seas. The English Government persists in the starvation war, which in truth does not hit the fighting forces of its opponent, but compels women and children, the sick and the old, to suffer grievous privations for the Fatherland's sake, which are endangering the people's strength. Thus the British lust of power increases the sufferings of the world in a cold-blooded manner and regardless of the laws of humanity, regardless also of the protests of severely prejudiced neutrals, and even of the silent desire for peace among the peoples of England's own allies.

"Every day by which the terrible struggle is prolonged brings new devastations, new distress, new death. Every day by which the war is shortened preserves on both sides the lives of thousands of brave fighters, and is a blessing to tortured mankind. The Imperial Government would not be able to answer before its own conscience, before the German people, or before history, if it left any means whatever untried to hasten the end of the war. It agreed with the President of the United States in hoping to attain this aim by negotiations. The attempt to reach an understanding having been answered by the enemy with the announcement of intensified war, the Imperial Government, if it wishes to serve humanity in the higher sense and not to commit a wrong against its own citizens, must continue the battle now forced upon it anew with all weapons. It must, therefore, abandon the limitations which it has hitherto imposed upon itself in the employment of its weapons at sea. Trusting that the American people and their Government will not close their eyes to the reasons for this resolution and its necessity, the Imperial Government hopes that the United States will appreciate the new state of affairs from the high standpoint of impartiality, and will also on their part help to prevent further misery and a sacrifice of human lives which might be avoided. While I venture, as regards details of the projected war measures, to refer to the attached Memorandum, I venture at the same time to express the expectation that the American Government will warn American ships against entering the barred zones described in the Annexe, and its subjects against entrusting passengers or goods to vessels trading with harbours in the barred zones."

The Memorandum which is mentioned in the last passage as being annexed to the German Note is of strategic rather than political interest, and is quoted elsewhere (see *The European War*, p. 6).

The commencement of the new submarine campaign caused

the United States immediately to sever diplomatic relations with Germany, although America did not actually declare war until two months later. The German Government were, of course, fully prepared for this development, and the chauvinists hailed the new situation with delight. The moderate newspapers were silent and acquiescent, but in various parts of the country, especially in the South, members of the Minority Socialist Party were arrested owing to their violent denunciations of the new policy.

On February 27 the Chancellor delivered a long speech to the Reichstag, in which he dealt with the severance of relations with America and with other matters. Referring to President Wilson's message to Congress of February 3, the speaker said that the new submarine campaign was not a violation of the pledge given after the *Sussex* incident, since that pledge had always been conditional upon the American Government proving able to induce "all the beligerent nations to observe the laws of humanity." The Chancellor complained that America had not attempted to enforce International Law when it was broken by the Entente Powers, and he alleged that on July 14, 1914, Sir Percy Scott had predicted that submarine warfare would develop in precisely the manner in which it was now being waged by Germany, and that he (Sir Percy Scott) had said that this could not be held to be an infringement of International Law. Even so, however, the present German methods were, said the Chancellor, only a retaliation on account of Great Britain's illegal blockade.

The financial position of the Empire constituted a problem which gave constant anxiety to both statesmen and people of Germany. The pre-war debt of the Empire had amounted to only 240,000,000*l.*, but the several states possessed individual debts, which together reached the sum of 800,000,000*l.* Thus the real aggregate indebtedness of the federation amounted to over a milliard sterling before the war. The war-credits voted by Parliament up to the end of 1916 reached the total of 3,200,000,000*l.* This sum, which it was hoped would meet the war expenditure up to about the end of March, 1917, was by no means covered by the subscriptions to the five great war-loans which the Imperial Government had issued. The total subscriptions to these five loans amounted to nearly 2,360,000,000*l.* The funds actually subscribed towards the cost of the war thus fell short of the expenditure by a sum of over 800,000,000*l.* In March a sixth war-loan was issued, and this remained open from March 15 to April 16, and later for troops at the front. The loan was issued in the form of 5 per cent. Imperial Bonds and 4½ per cent. Imperial Bonds, the terms for the redemption of which were, of course, slightly different in the two cases. Both classes of stock were issued at 98. The loan was a greater success than either the fourth or the fifth war-loan, and the subscriptions reached the huge total of nearly

660,000,000*l.*, exclusive of the conversion of holdings in the previous loans. In the meantime, however, the Reichstag had, in February, voted another war-credit, this time for the sum of no less than 750,000,000*l.*

The Finance Minister, Count von Roedern, introduced the proposals for 1917 into the Reichstag on February 17. He said that war-taxation to the extent of 62,500,000*l.* would have to be imposed, this being 38,500,000*l.* in excess of the war-taxes in the previous year. The production of the collieries was to be taxed to the extent of 25,000,000*l.*, and a sur-tax would be imposed upon passenger and goods traffic on the railways, and also upon internal shipping. The ordinary Budget for 1917-18 was expected to balance at 247,050,000*l.* The Minister stated that the rate of German war expenditure had continued to rise, the average per month for the four months October to January being nearly 140,000,000*l.* Nevertheless, the total expenditure of the Entente was, he said, still approximately double that of the Central Powers.

The figures for the Prussian Budget for 1917-18 were announced by the Finance Minister, Dr. Lentze, on January 16. It was estimated that the revenue and expenditure would balance at 258,038,286*l.*, a sum which was about 17,000,000*l.* in excess of the respective totals for the two previous years. The expenditure included an item of 10,000,000*l.* for the relief of distress due to the war.

During the spring and early summer the population suffered from scarcity of food more severely than at any previous period of the war; and, of course, no supplies of grain were forthcoming from Rumania until after the harvest. In particular, the shortage of bread was more serious even than it had been in the spring of 1916, and in April the bread-ration in Prussia was reduced from 4 lbs. to 3 lbs. per week. The Prussian Food Controller, Dr. Michaelis, was, however, able to alleviate the tension caused by this new reduction by increasing the weekly ration of meat from $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. to 1 lb., and by guaranteeing 5 lbs. of potatoes per head—a quantity which had not always been obtainable hitherto. The increase of the meat-ration was a triumph of organisation. In spite of the difficulties of supplying and apportioning fodder, the number of cattle in Germany had not decreased since the outbreak of the war. There were still approximately 21,000,000 head of cattle in the country. The bread-ration was subsequently raised again to $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.

During the summer the problems of war-aims were discussed as actively in Germany as in other countries of Europe, and a debate on the subject took place in the Reichstag on May 15. Herr Rösicke, a Conservative, urged that Germany ought not to conclude peace without annexations and indemnities, but Herr Scheidemann, leader of the Majority Socialists, referring to this same point, whether the two groups should mutually agree to the new Russian formula of "No

Annexations and no Indemnities," said "If France and Great Britain renounced annexations, and the German Government persisted nevertheless in demanding annexations, there would be a revolution in this country. However, the enemy do not renounce annexations" This declaration was the more remarkable in that it was made by a Majority not by a Minority Socialist. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg made a long speech, in which, however, he refused to enter into the details of war-aims, and refused alike to renounce all possible claims to annexations and indemnities, or to bind himself to plans of conquest.

The proposal to hold a peace conference of Socialist Parties at Stockholm found favour in Germany, not only amongst the proletariat but in governing circles. The Government were willing to grant passports to the Majority section, and, after some hesitation, consented to allow the Minority section also to attend the proposed meeting. Owing to the opposition of the French and British Governments the conference was not held, but representatives of both German parties did in fact proceed to Sweden and there propounded their respective views on possible peace conditions to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee who were endeavouring to organise the conference. The declarations of the Scheidemann party were duly published, and these covered very many of the points in dispute between the belligerents. The chief items in the programme of this party were as follows: (1) No annexations. All conquered territories and colonies to be restored. (2) No indemnities. One-sided "war-damages" would only be indemnities in a masked form. (3) Belgium to be restored to complete independence, free alike from any suzerainty of Germany, France, or Great Britain. (4) Poland, as delimited by the Congress of Vienna, to have complete independence. (5) In regard to Alsace-Lorraine, "these provinces are ethnologically of German descent, the language of nine-tenths of the people being German. They were torn from Germany by force at an earlier date, and were merely recovered in 1871. France has no historic right to them. The restitution of Alsace-Lorraine to France would be nothing less than an unjustifiable annexation. Nevertheless, the province should have equal rights with the other states within the German Empire." (6) Limitation of armaments and creation of an international force to prevent aggression (7) No commercial war after the war. Condition of general Free Trade should be established. (8) Treaties to be submitted to Parliaments, and secret diplomacy to be abolished.

The Memorandum submitted to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee by the Minority Socialists differed considerably from the programme outlined above, and brought the position of the party into close proximity to the point of view adopted by the less extreme publicists in Entente countries. In addition to the concessions advocated by the Majority Socialists, the Min-

ority made the following important suggestions: (1) Independence of Belgium, with financial reparation from Germany. (2) Independence of the whole of Poland (including the Prussian and Austrian territories) and not merely of Russian Poland. (3) Destiny of Alsace-Lorraine to be decided absolutely by a free and secret plebiscite of the inhabitants of that province. The Minority Socialists advocated, however, the return of the German colonies, on the ground that their retention might create a cause for a new war.

The Reichstag held an important session during July. The struggle between the moderates and the chauvinists broke out afresh, and in the turmoil which ensued the Imperial Chancellor himself and other leading statesmen were compelled to resign. The movement for a "reasonable peace," on some such terms as those advocated by the Majority Socialists, was constantly gathering force in the country. And Herr Scheidemann's propaganda was now reinforced from an altogether different quarter. Under the leadership of the new Kaiser and Count Czernin, Austria had come to favour officially the conception of a peace of reconciliation, and the attitude of Vienna naturally had great influence upon the growth of opinion in all Catholic Germany. The ties between Vienna and Munich and Stuttgart were still peculiarly close in many respects, and thus it came about that many circles in the Hohenzollern Empire found themselves in much closer sympathy with the Government at Vienna than with the Government at Berlin. It must not be supposed that there was any approach to a political split between the two Empires. There was no thought of that. But Vienna represented one current in Germany—a new current—and Berlin represented another current. Under the influence of the Catholic peace-movement, Herr Erzberger, a prominent member of the Centre Party, made a speech to the Main Committee of the Reichstag on July 6, demanding peace "without annexations and indemnities." The speech caused a great sensation in the House and in the country, and Herr Erzberger was repudiated by the leader of his own party, Herr Spahn, and was attacked by Count Westarp, leader of the Conservatives, and also by Herr Helfferich, Minister of the Interior. Herr Erzberger was, however, supported by many of the Centre members and by the Socialists.

The parliamentary situation became extremely troublesome for the Government, because the moderates, who were now for the first time adopting an active policy, were demanding domestic reforms, especially franchise reform in Prussia, as well as the modifications in foreign policy. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg no longer found it possible to maintain his equipoise between the two parties, and on July 14 he resigned. His departure was no loss to Germany. So far as it is possible for a contemporary to judge, it would seem probable that the historian will always dismiss Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg as a contemptibly

weak statesman who, whilst probably not actually plotting the crimes of the Pan-German cliques, nor wholly failing to appreciate their iniquity, yet failed utterly to use his influence to save his country from dishonour. Von Bethmann had been Chancellor since July, 1909. The Emperor appointed Herr Georg Michaelis, Food Controller for Prussia, as Chancellor of the Empire and Premier of Prussia. The appointment was deemed a triumph for the reactionaries, but Herr Michaelis showed himself not altogether devoid of tact in dealing with the moderates in Parliament.

The immediate task of the new Chancellor was to avoid an open rupture with the Reichstag Majority (that is, the Centre, the Radicals, and the Majority Socialists), and this he achieved by accepting a resolution on war-aims which was proposed and passed in the House on July 19. The resolution itself was said to constitute a compromise, the repudiation of chauvinism was said to have been less forcibly expressed than Herr Erzberger desired. The text of the resolution was as follows: "On the threshold of the fourth year of the war the Reichstag declares. As on August 4, 1914, the truth of the motto remains: 'No desire for conquest actuates us.' Germany took up arms for the defence of her freedom and independence, and to secure the integrity of her territory. Declining all thoughts of the forcible acquisition of territory, the Reichstag strives for a Peace by Agreement, and a permanent reconciliation of the nations. With such a peace, political, economic, and financial oppression are incompatible. The Reichstag also rejects all plans which aim at economic exclusion and enmity between peoples after the war. Only an economic peace, with freedom of the seas, will, after the termination of the war, prepare the ground for permanently friendly relations between the nations. Actuated by these considerations and aims, the Reichstag will vigorously support the institution of international organisations for the strengthening of international law. So long, however, as the hostile Governments reject such a peace and threaten Germany and her Allies with schemes for conquest and oppression, the German people are determined unshakably to stand together and to endure, for the defence of their own and their allies' right to live and to develop. The German people know that united in defence they are invincible."

This resolution was passed by 212 votes against 126, with a few abstentions; it was supported by the Centre, the Radicals, and the Majority Socialists, and was opposed by the Conservatives, National Liberals, and Independent Socialists. The Conservatives and National Liberals on the one hand opposed the motion because they desired a "German peace," with annexations, and the Independent Socialists on the other hand because they held that it did not go sufficiently far in the direction of conciliation. Herr Michaelis made his first speech as Chancellor, and accepted the resolution, but his speech covered a

wide field of politics, beginning with the origin of the war and ending with Prussian franchise reform, and he said little about war-aims. He said that "the frontiers of the German Empire must be made secure for all time," and that there ought to be no economic wars after the war. "These aims," said the new Chancellor, "may be attained within the limits of your resolution, as I interpret it" The trend of the Chancellor's speech was, however, distinctly more Conservative than that of the Reichstag majority's resolution. The House then passed war-credits for a further sum of 750,000,000⁷, only the Independent Socialists opposing the vote.

On July 28 Herr Michaelis made a speech to a gathering of journalists, in which he dealt chiefly with the ambitions, or alleged ambitions, of France. He claimed that the French Government had concluded with the Tsar's Government, shortly before the Revolution, a secret treaty by which it was agreed that not only should Alsace-Lorraine be restored to France, but that in addition the other German territory west of the Rhine should be severed from the Empire and established as a buffer state. The speaker alleged that this had been admitted by the French Ministers in the secret sittings of the Chamber of Deputies at the beginning of June.

The new Chancellor reconstructed both the Imperial and the Prussian Cabinets, and made several important changes. The new German Administration included the following statesmen:—

Chancellor of the Empire—Herr G. Michaelis.
Minister of the Interior (and Vice-Chancellor)—Herr Helfferich
Foreign Minister—Baron von Kuhlmann.
Finance Minister—Count Roedern.
Minister of Marine—Admiral von Capelle.
Minister for the Colonies—Herr Solf.
Minister of Justice—Herr von Krause.
Minister of Posts—Herr Rudlin.
Minister for War Savings—Herr Schwander.
Food Controller—Herr von Waldow.

It will be noticed that Herr Zimmermann was replaced at the Foreign Office by Baron von Kuhlmann. The new Foreign Minister was a cleverer man than his immediate predecessor, but his record was not such as to inspire confidence abroad. He had been Councillor at the Embassy in London at the time of the outbreak of war, and in his subtle and insincere arguments for British neutrality he had then shown himself extraordinarily incapable of understanding how the honest, if unimaginative, mind of the British people would view the actions of his Government.

The Prussian Ministry was constituted as follows:—

Prime Minister—Herr G. Michaelis.
Vice-Chairman of the Cabinet—Herr Helfferich.
Foreign Minister—Baron von Kuhlmann.
War Minister—General von Stein.
Finance Minister—Herr Hergt.
Minister of the Interior—Herr Drews.

Minister of Justice—Herr Spahn
Minister of Education—Herr Schmidt.
Minister of Commerce—Herr Sydow.
Minister of Public Works—Herr von Breitenbach
Minister of Agriculture—Herr von Eisenhart-Rothe

It should be observed that the Imperial and Prussian Food Ministries became fused into one office. Herr Spahn was a member of the Prussian House of Representatives as well as of the Reichstag.

At the end of August the Chancellor brought into existence a new political body, a so-called "Free Committee" of both Houses of the Imperial Parliament. The Bundesrat was to delegate seven members to this committee, and likewise the Reichstag seven members. The Chancellor was to be Chairman. The seven representatives of the Reichstag were to be selected by the great political parties, two by the Catholics, two by the Socialists, and one each by the Conservatives, National Liberals, and Radicals. The object of the new committee was to facilitate constant intercourse between the Government and Parliament.

Herr Michaelis was Chancellor for a period of only three months, and his term of office was not eventful. His most important action was to draw up, or to collaborate in drawing up, the German reply to the Pope's peace note. The reply, which was signed by Herr Michaelis and was addressed to Cardinal Gasparri, was published on September 21. The note opened by relating at length what the Chancellor described as the Emperor's efforts to preserve peace, from the beginning of his reign onwards. The German Government, it was then declared, shared the desire of the Pope to see reciprocal limitation of armaments, and also the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. If, after the war, fraternal relations were to be established between the nations, "the important thing is to lay more stress upon what unites them than upon what separates them in their relations." The German Government hoped that their enemies would see in the Pope's proposals a suitable basis for the re-establishment of peace.

As will be seen, the tone of the German note was conciliatory, but it was totally devoid of definite suggestions, the only indications which it gave of the German Government's attitude towards peace terms being the vague approval of the Pope's note and a mere reference (which it also made) to the Reichstag's resolution of July 19.

The Reichstag opened for a short session at the end of September. Baron von Kühlmann delivered a long speech to the Main Committee of the House on September 28. The Minister expressed great fear, probably genuine, for the fate of all Europe if the war were prolonged much longer, but he made no definite suggestions on the question of peace terms. On October 9, in another speech to the Reichstag, the Foreign Minister declared that the question about which the struggle was continuing was

not, primarily, the Belgian question, but "the question for which Europe is being turned more and more into a heap of ruins is the question of the future of Alsace-Lorraine." Germany, said the Minister, would never make any concessions with regard to Alsace-Lorraine, but this question was the only "absolute impediment" to peace.

On October 9 the Minister of Marine, Admiral von Capelle, announced that there had been a mutiny in the Navy, and that the ringleaders had been executed. The announcement caused much excitement at the time, but it transpired that the affair was of small dimensions.

On October 31 it was announced that Herr Michaelis had resigned the Chancellorship. He was succeeded by the Bavarian Prime Minister, Count von Hertling, who was known to be favourable to the three moderate parties in the Reichstag—the Catholics, the Radicals, and the Majority Socialists. Count Hertling resigned his position as Premier of Bavaria but became nominally Prime Minister of Prussia. The new Chancellor was a Catholic, and a member of the Centre Party, of whose contingent in the Reichstag he had once been the leader. The position of a Bavarian as Premier of Prussia appeared at first sight highly anomalous, but it must be remembered that he held that appointment not as leader of a majority in the Prussian Diet (which he was not), but as being chief political adviser of Prussia's King. The anomaly was obviated by appointing a certain Herr Friedberg, a Prussian National Liberal, as Deputy Premier of Prussia. Baron von Kuhlmann remained Foreign Minister, and Herr O. von Dandl became Bavarian Premier. Hertling and Kuhlmann delivered several long speeches in the Reichstag during November and December, but the most definite indications respecting the foreign policy and peace aims of these statesmen were to be found in the ideas set forth in the peace negotiations with Russia. (See *The European War*, Chapter III.)

Another German War Loan, the seventh, was issued in the autumn, being in the form of 5 per cent. bonds and four and a half per cent. Treasury bills, the price of both being 98. The total amount of the subscriptions received was about 631,000,000L.

In the provincial politics of Germany, by far the most important event of the year was the serious adoption by the authorities of a far-reaching scheme for the reform of the Prussian Parliament. It will be remembered that the Prussian franchise was based upon the "three-class" system, which gave much political power to a minority of rich persons, and very little influence, relatively to their numbers, to the poorer sections of the population. A project for the reform of the Diet was formally promised by the King in an announcement issued on April 8, but it was not until November that the details of the scheme were made known. Three separate Bills were to be introduced. The first would alter the constitution of the

House of Nobles, the second would democratise the suffrage for the Lower House, and the third would increase the powers of the Upper House in respect of Money Bills. The second Bill, which was indubitably most drastic and democratic in character, was the most important. The three-class system was to be swept away. Equal direct suffrage with secret ballots and automatic redistribution on the basis of population was to be established. There was to be no plural voting. The scheme for the reform of the Upper House would give that chamber the character, to a great extent, of a nominated Senate. The hereditary element was to be much reduced, though not totally abolished. The persons nominated were to be selected as representing the landed gentry, the great municipalities, industry, the Universities, the Churches, and so forth. The object of the third Bill was to give the Upper House power to amend a Money Bill, and not merely (as previously) to accept or reject it in its entirety. At the end of the year these great schemes of reform had been definitely adopted by the Prussian Government, but had not yet passed the national legislature. Liberals and Socialists were enthusiastic at the prospect of attaining the long-discussed reform of the Prussian franchise, but much opposition was to be expected in the Diet, where the so-called "Junkers," led by Count Yorck von Wartenberg and others, were naturally very hostile to the curtailment of the historic privileges of their class.

The Saxon Government also brought forward a scheme of parliamentary reform.

At the end of the year the whole German nation was anxiously watching the peace negotiations that were taking place at Brest-Litovsk. And, apart from certain extreme militarists, the German people were earnestly hoping that the conference would lead to peace, not only with Russia, but with all the hostile countries.

II AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Rarely has it fallen to the lot of a new monarch to succeed to his heritage in circumstances more adverse than those which surrounded the young Emperor Charles of Austria. His dominions were beset by innumerable external foes and were weakened by the seditious ambitions of millions of his own subjects. Yet at the outset of his reign the Emperor quickly showed signs of a strength of character which came somewhat as a surprise to Europe, and it appeared possible that he would prove capable of dealing even with the immense difficulties which now faced him. The Emperor immediately chose new advisers. He made Count Ottokar Czernin Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, and called upon Count Clam-Martinitz to form a new Cabinet for Austria. Both these statesmen being Czechs, the new appointments were assumed to indicate a

Slavophil tendency on the part of the Sovereign, but although these changes were effected in the Common Ministry and in the Austrian Government, no similar changes were made in Buda-Pest, where Count Tisza, the reactionary and chauvinistic Premier, continued to rule.

The Emperor's policy was of a markedly conciliatory character, both at home and abroad. Unlike his grand-uncle he did not begin his reign as an advocate of German domination throughout Austria. On the contrary, his object was to work the political machinery of the Austrian Empire with each nationality playing an appropriate and honourable part. Similarly, his foreign policy was equally far removed from that of the protagonists of race-hatred, and he hoped not only to conclude an early peace, but to re-establish truly amicable relations between the nations of Europe. A satisfactory basis for peace in Europe could only be found, said the Kaiser, at the opening of the Reithsrat in May, "in mutual recognition of a glorious defence." This phrase indicated his whole attitude towards the war. The moderate sentiments which thus animated the highest circles and official circles in the old capital of Germany were not without influence further north; and the new Kaiser was notoriously, if informally, associated with that movement to obtain a moderate or "reasonable" peace, in which the Catholic Party in Germany took the lead. During the spring a hardening of opinion and an accession of strength to unscrupulous chauvinism were very noticeable in Berlin; but in Vienna, and to some extent also in Munich, the drift of thought and of feeling was in an altogether different direction.

The first great political speech of the year was delivered by Count Tisza in the Hungarian Parliament on January 24, and in this oration the Premier dealt with the questions which had been raised by the Allies' reply to President Wilson's peace-move, and by Dr Wilson's recent philosophic address to the United States Senate. Austria-Hungary and her Allies were, he said, prepared to discuss terms of peace, and moreover they were willing to propose such terms as should, they believed, be acceptable to the Entente Powers. Austria-Hungary did not desire domination, but wished to see a lasting peace and the establishment of harmonious conditions in Europe. On the other hand, the hostile countries avowedly aimed, said the Prime Minister, at the disintegration of the Dual Monarchy. "In such circumstances there can be no doubt which group of Powers by its attitude is the obstacle to peace, and which group by its attitude approximates to President Wilson's conception."

Count Tisza then proceeded to make some interesting, if only partly convincing, observations upon the "principle of nationalities," which was being greatly advertised in Entente countries and in some neutral states at this time. This principle was, said the speaker, held in high honour in Hungary. "The principle of nationalities in the formation of national

states can, however, only prevail unrestrictedly where single nationalities dwell within sharply marked ethnographical and geographical boundaries, segregated in compact masses and inhabiting regions suited to the organisation of independent states. In other regions where various nationalities live intermingled with one another, it is impossible for every single nationality to form a national state. In such regions it is only possible to create a state without a national character, or a state in which one nationality, that which by its numbers and importance naturally tends to predominate, is permitted to impress its character upon the whole. In these circumstances, the only practicable application of the principle of nationalities is to assure to each people, as the President rightly demands, security of life and property, freedom of religion, and the 'right to develop its idiosyncrasies, both individually and socially'." Count Tisza concluded his speech by iterating that Austria-Hungary was "ready to do everything that might guarantee to the peoples of Europe the blessings of lasting peace."

The Prime Minister's comments on the limitations of the principle of nationalities were intended, of course, to answer the theoretical considerations which were held in Entente countries to justify the disruption of the Dual Monarchy. His statement that the intermingling of several nationalities in a single area constitutes a fatal objection to the formation of a national state for each of the intermingled nationalities is of course obviously true, but the objection does not apply, or applies only in part, to the Austro-Hungarian problem. The obstacle exists in an acute form in Transylvania, and exists to some extent in the case of Bohemia. But in the case of Croatia, and in that of the Jugo-Slav provinces of Austria and in the Polish and Ruthenian divisions, respectively, of Galicia, Count Tisza's objection has no application and no validity, since in all these territories a high degree of segregation does in fact exist.

Although Austrian and Hungarian statesmen made great efforts to win American approval during December and January, there was never any serious doubt that the outbreak of war between Germany and the United States over the submarine issue would be followed by a rupture of relations between the latter country and the Dual Monarchy. On February 20 Mr. Penfield, the United States Ambassador in Vienna, presented a note to the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office, reminding the Ministry that after the sinking of the *Ancona* in November, 1915, the Austro-Hungarian Government had given a pledge that merchant vessels should not in the future be sunk without due regard to the saving of the human lives endangered, and that the pledge had been renewed after the sinking of the *Persia*, in January, 1916. Since, however, this pledge appeared to be modified by the fact that the Austro-Hungarian Government had now associated itself with the new German submarine campaign, the United States Government desired to be finally

and clearly informed of the standpoint which the Austro-Hungarian Government adopted in these circumstances, and also whether the assurance given in the *Ancona* and *Persia* cases was to be regarded as changed or withdrawn.

The reply of the Austro-Hungarian Government was delivered on March 5 and was of great length. The most important points brought forward in the note were as follows: The Austro-Hungarian Government, it was stated, held to the principle of its pledge given at the time of the *Ancona* incident, but it was contended that the obligation to warn a merchantman before sinking her was met by the giving of a general warning to all merchantmen not to enter a given marine area. This was, in fact, the more humane method of warning, since a warning given at the last moment involved exposing passengers and crew in small boats to all the perils of the elements. The note further denied that neutrals could expect the same security if they chose to travel on merchantmen belonging to hostile belligerents as they could legitimately claim on neutral vessels. It was also contended that the manner in which the Entente Powers were arming and using merchantmen was irregular in International Law. The note closed by stating that if Austria-Hungary was interfering with marine traffic, this was only because a purely defensive war had been forced upon her.

A few weeks later, after the American declaration of war upon Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Government severed its relations with Washington. The Austro-Hungarian Ambassador asked for his passports on April 8, and Sweden took over the interests of the monarchy in the United States. Mr. Penfield left Vienna on the same date. He stated that the Austrian authorities had treated him to the last with every courtesy. The rupture of diplomatic relations was not followed, however, by an immediate declaration of war.

The Russian Revolution was the cause of somewhat important reactions in the Dual Monarchy. In Austria-Hungary, as in Germany, hatred and fear of Tsarism had been the most potent war-stimulus in those large sections of the common folk who were altogether averse from bellicose adventures. The fall of Tsarism was, therefore, greeted with a great sigh of relief, and it strengthened the desire for peace even in German-Austria and in Hungary. Amongst the Slavs, and especially in Galicia, the reactions were much more notable. Indeed, the whole outlook of the Austrian Poles was fundamentally altered. It will be remembered that throughout the war the Galician Poles had been not only obedient but enthusiastically loyal to the Habsburgs. The cause of this is well known. The Galicians might dream, and many of them did dream, of a reunited and independent Poland, but they knew full well that in the actual conditions prevailing in East-Central Europe their lot was a fortunate one. They saw their brethren suffering under the

iron mastery of Prussia and under the violent and inefficient tyranny of Muscovy, and they congratulated themselves on the fact that they owed allegiance to the relatively tolerant sovereignty of Austria. And the high-sounding promises of Russia at the beginning of the war obtained little credence in Russian Poland, and none in the Austrian territory. The Austrians had treated Galicia relatively well; they had, in fact, treated that country in much the same manner in which the British had treated Quebec; and they had profited during the war, as stated, by the fact that Austria's neighbours, Prussia, Russia, and Hungary, were all grossly intolerant Powers. Now, however, the position had been changed, and almost reversed. The Austrian Kaiser might be, and no doubt was, preferable as a suzerain to the Russian Tsar, but was not more to be expected from this new, ultra-Liberal, and almost extravagantly kindly Russian democracy? Every Pole inevitably asked himself that question. And whilst the brilliant band of leaders in Cracow and Lemberg did not desire to betray and wished no evil to the Power from which they had received important benefits, they naturally thought first of Polish nationality, and seeing the vision of complete independence, they became extremely restive.

The financial position of the monarchy, which during the first year and a half of war had been but little worse than that of France and Germany (see A.R., 1916, p 248), became rapidly more disastrous during 1916 and 1917. The rate of Austro-Hungarian expenditure increased considerably during 1916, and at the end of that year the total war expenditure of this Power was slightly over 1,800,000,000*l.* (the value of 44,000,000,000 kronen at the pre-war rate of exchange). Of this gigantic sum the Austrian share amounted to approximately 1,170,000,000*l.* and the Hungarian share to 660,000,000*l.* Since the pre-war debts of the two halves of the Empire aggregated about 800,000,000*l.* the total indebtedness of the monarchy at the end of 1916 was about 2,600,000,000*l.* At the beginning of 1917 the monarchy was spending nearly 90,000,000*l.* per month on the war, the rate of expenditure having increased by about 50 per cent. since the beginning of 1916. Now up to the end of 1916 five Austrian and five Hungarian war-loans had been issued. The total amount of the subscriptions to the two Austrian loans issued in 1916 was 380,000,000*l.*, and to the two corresponding Hungarian loans 185,000,000*l.* was subscribed. The six loans (three Austrian and three Hungarian) issued before the end of 1915 had produced about 560,000,000*l.*, and hence the grand total subscribed up to the end of 1916 was nearly 1,130,000,000*l.*, that is, 700,000,000*l.* less than the grand total of the war expenditure.

In April the Austro-Hungarian War Minister, General Baron von Krobatin, resigned, and General S von Steinstatt was appointed as his successor. Baron von Krobatin remained on the active list, however, and subsequently commanded one of

the Austrian armies during the invasion of Venetia. General von Steinstatte had previously held the command of an Army corps on the Italian Front.

At the end of May the Reichsrat, the Imperial Parliament of Austria, assembled for the first time since the outbreak of war. The preliminary formalities took place on May 30 and on the following day the Kaiser delivered his speech from the Throne. The speech was of great length. The Emperor began by paying a tribute to the memory of his immediate predecessor, and declared that he was firmly resolved to preserve to the people their Constitutional right to a share in controlling affairs of State. He was mindful, therefore, of his obligation to take the oath to the Constitution, whilst remembering also that according to the fundamental laws of Austria it was upon him alone that the decisions in regard to peace terms would rest. The Emperor was convinced "that the happy development of Constitutional life after the unfruitfulness of recent years and after the exceptional political conditions of war-time—aside from the solution of the Galician question, for which my illustrious predecessor already indicated the way—is not possible without expanding the Constitution and the administrative foundations of the whole of our public life, both in the Empire and in the several kingdoms and lands, especially in Bohemia." The Kaiser proceeded to say that he hoped that in union with himself the Reichsrat would be able "speedily to create conditions which will give scope, within the unity of the State and safeguarding its powers, to the free national and cultural development of equally privileged peoples." On this ground, the Sovereign had decided to postpone the taking of the Constitutional oath until the new foundations of Austria had been laid. The Kaiser then referred to the readiness of the Central Powers to make peace on terms equitable to both sides, and stated that a lasting peace could only be secured by "mutual recognition of a glorious defence." New Russia, said the speaker, appeared to be approaching an agreement with this standpoint. "Whilst our group of Powers is fighting for honour and existence with irresistible force, it is and remains, towards every one who honestly abandons the intention to threaten us, fully prepared to cease hostilities, and whoever wants to open again better and more human relations will assuredly find on this side a ready and conciliatory spirit." The Emperor then referred to the internal conditions of the country, to the fortitude with which the population had borne the sufferings of war, and to the success of the sixth war-loan. The monarch concluded by saying: "Honourable Gentlemen of both Houses, once again accept my cordial greetings. It is a great moment which brings a new ruler face to face for the first time with the people's representatives. May it be the beginning of an epoch of flourishing progress, a time of power and prestige for venerable Austria, and of happiness and blessing for my beloved peoples. God grant it."

It is evident from the fact that the Kaiser took the course of postponing his Constitutional oath that he had in mind some very far-reaching reforms in the political framework of Austria. Francis Joseph, shortly before his death, had promised an increase of the legal powers of the autonomous province of Galicia,¹ and it is clear that Charles contemplated an extension of the powers of the provincial diets in the other territories as well.

The proceedings both on May 30th and on the 31st were full of interest. On the 30th the leader of the German National League, Dr Gustav Gross, was elected President of the House of Representatives. An important declaration was made by the leader of the Czech Nationalists, Herr Stanek, on behalf of the party he led. This declaration stated that the dual system of Government of the Habsburg dominions had been a failure, since it had involved the creation of dominant and subject peoples, and urged that "the reshaping of the Habsburg monarchy into a federation of free national states, enjoying equal rights, has become a matter of imperative necessity." Further, it was added that the party "will strive for the union of all the branches of the Czecho-Slav peoples into a democratic state in which that branch of the Czecho-Slavs which lies adjacent to the historic frontiers of our Bohemian fatherland (*i.e.*, the Slovaks, who dwell within the Hungarian border) cannot be overlooked." A parallel declaration was made by Herr Košošec on behalf of the Jugo-Slavs. The two cases were quite similar, since part of the Jugo-Slav people lived not in Austria but in Hungary, a fact which rendered the desired reform more difficult of realisation, both on account of Constitutional and legal complications, and also because the most vigorous opposition to Slav claims came not from Austrians but from Magyars.

The Premier, Count Clam-Martinitz, indicated the Government's position in regard to the national claims in the sessions in June, and said that the demands in the form in which they had been presented were impracticable. The Prime Minister also failed to come to any agreement with the Polish party, who had hitherto been reckoned as supporters of the Government, and hence the Cabinet found themselves in a minority in the Lower House, and therefore resigned on June 18. Count Clam-Martinitz was forthwith appointed Governor-General of Montenegro. The Emperor then called upon Dr. von Seidler to form a Ministry, and this statesman constructed a Cabinet composed of the following personages:—

Minister of the Interior—Count Toggenburg
Minister of Finance—Dr. Wimmer.
Food Controller—Heinrich Hoefer.
Minister of Defence—General Czapp von Birkenstetten
Minister of Commerce—Herr Mattaia.
Minister of Education—Dr. Cwiklinsky.
Minister of Justice—Dr. Schauer.
Minister of Public Works—Herr von Homann.
Minister of Communications—Baron von Banhans.

¹ The promise to Galicia was couched in very vague terms. See A.R., 1916, pp. 253-4.

The new Prime Minister was able to establish a working agreement with the Poles, and since the German and Polish parties together possessed a majority in the Lower House, the position of the new Cabinet in the Reichsrat was fairly secure. A Bill was passed prolonging the life of Parliament until December 31, 1918.

In the meantime there had also occurred a Ministerial crisis and a change of Government in Hungary. Count Tisza's opinions were so completely unlike those of the new Sovereign that it was obvious that a crisis could not be long deferred. The King perceived that if justice was to be done to his Slav subjects, whether by reorganising Austria and Hungary separately, or, more logically, by rearranging the subordinate legislatures of the monarchy as a whole in the manner demanded by Herr Stanek, the first necessity was to get rid of the undemocratic franchise of Hungary. The Hungarian House of Representatives, like the Russian Duma and the Prussian Lower House, was based upon a large oligarchy, not upon the manhood of the State as a whole. Count Tisza feared and opposed the schemes for a democratic reform of the suffrage, though these had long been discussed, and he also disliked the idea of federalism. The King thought, no doubt rightly, that a House elected upon a democratic basis would prove much more amenable to his radical proposals than would the existing Chamber, and hence in May the Premier found it necessary to resign. Count Tisza, with the rank of Colonel, then proceeded to the Front.

The new Prime Minister was Count Moritz Esterhazy, a young politician who was a member of one of the leading families of the Hungarian nobility, and who had been educated at Oxford as well as at Budapest University. He had left Oxford as recently as 1904. The selection of such a young man caused some surprise. Count Esterhazy's Cabinet included Count Albert Apponyi (Education), General Szurmay (Defence), M. Gratz (Finance), Count Aladar Zichy (Croatia), and several other politicians.

On July 3 the Emperor, in pursuance of his policy of conciliation, issued a general amnesty for political prisoners, who had been sentenced for high treason, *lèse-majesté*, and similar offences. Many Slav and Italian "politicals" were thus released from prison, amongst them being Dr. Kramarsch, the Czech leader, and Count Zippel, who was Mayor of Trent.

Count Esterhazy's term of office was brief. He was not able to obtain sufficient parliamentary support, and in the middle of August the Cabinet was reconstructed with Dr. Alexander Wekerle as Premier. Dr. Wekerle received the support of many of the members of the so-called "Party of National Work"—the Ministerialists under the Tisza Administration. The new Prime Minister announced that a great scheme of suffrage reform would be introduced, the new

Cabinet being entirely in accord with its immediate predecessor on this point. The responsibility for the details of the measure was placed upon M. Vazsonyi, who was made a member of the Government for this purpose, and given the title of "Franchise Minister." The proposal was to enfranchise all males over 24 years of age who could pass an easy literacy test, and also to endow certain limited classes of women with the vote. The scheme as outlined was a great advance on the system then existing, though the literacy test would automatically exclude many of the ignorant Ruman and Ruthene peasants. The Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives in December.

A similar reform Bill was introduced in the Croatian legislature in November.

In the meantime the Austrian authorities were working out an important scheme of Constitutional reform. Austria already possessed a democratic franchise, but the object of the new proposals was to rearrange the provincial legislatures according to the principle of nationalities. It was proposed to reduce the number of the provinces, and to increase the powers of the provincial legislatures. The Federal Parliament at Vienna would, of course, continue to exist as before, but its powers, whilst still sovereign, would be less detailed. The scheme, as published and advocated by the Czech moderates, involved the creation of seven autonomous provinces, as follows: (1) German-Austria, including the German part of that utterly unnatural province, Carinthia. (2) Vienna. (3) A greater Bohemia, including the existing province of Bohemia, and Moravia, and Silesia. (4) A Polish state, including western Galicia only. (5) A Ruthenian state, including eastern Galicia and Bukovina. (6) An Illyrian or Jugo-Slav state, including Görz and Gradiska, Istria, Dalmatia, and the Slovene part of Carinthia. (7) Trieste.

It was understood that this scheme, with or without minor modifications, represented the policy of the Austrian Government. Whilst the proposals were an improvement on the existing Constitutional arrangements and were a proof of the Liberal tendencies of German-Austria, it was almost impossible that they should satisfy the non-German nationalities. The scheme was, it will be noted, quite unlike that demanded by the Bohemian and Jugo-Slav spokesmen at the opening of the Reichsrat, in that it left the boundaries between Austria and Hungary unchanged, and left the Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs in Austria artificially isolated from their respective brethren in Hungary. It is possible that Austrian statesmen only regarded their scheme as a half-way house to the larger reform. The Magyars were the obstacle, but it was more than possible that suffrage reform in Hungary would change the tendency of Hungarian policy.

The Austro-Hungarian reply to the Pope's peace note was published on September 21. It expressed approval of the

principle of compulsory arbitration, and said that the Austro-Hungarian Government saw in the Pope's proposals a suitable basis for peace negotiations.

In a number of speeches made during the autumn, Count Czernin advocated a policy of complete and all-round disarmament. He said that this principle and compulsory arbitration constituted the necessary basis of a new and peaceful world-order.

The Austro-Hungarian Delegations met in December. The opening speech was delivered by the Kaiser on December 4. He said that he hoped the forces making for peace would speedily prevail, and that the Russians, in particular, might feel assured that "we sincerely desire to restore our former friendly relations with them." Resolutions were passed approving of Count Czernin's foreign policy.

During the summer a sixth Austrian War Loan and a sixth Hungarian War Loan were issued. The subscriptions to the former reached 205,000,000L and to the latter 130,000,000L

At the end of the year the thoughts of all the peoples of the Monarchy were turned towards the momentous peace negotiations that were taking place with Russia. In these negotiations the chief moderating influence on the side of the Central Powers was exercised by the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister.

The first thirteen months of the new reign had brought about important and beneficent changes in the policies of the Dual Monarchy, and a revival of Austrian, as distinct from Hungarian influence in Europe. The young Emperor had to a great extent broken with the past, and considerable credit was due to him. And among the statesmen of Central Europe who appeared to be working sincerely for a peace of real reconciliation, a high place must be given to Count Ottokar Czernin.

CHAPTER III.

RUSSIA, FINLAND, POLAND, TURKEY, AND THE MINOR STATES OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

I. RUSSIA.

IMPORTANT and dramatic as was the history of every great nation in 1917, probably no events were so pregnant with destiny as those which occurred in the Russian Empire. The largest white nation in the world burst into Revolution, and new forces were let loose in humanity whose full and ultimate effects no man could predict.

The very character of the Slavonic Race, a race which through two millennia had played a part in civilisation very subordinate to the achievements of the Teuton and the Latin, was

largely unknown. The innate capacities of the Slavs were quite clearly different from those of the other white races, and when the Russian began at last to win for himself a greater, and, it was to be hoped, a more worthy place in the world, it was evident that all civilisation would thereby be influenced.

The scale of the Revolution, the first events of which took place in March, was of course gigantic. It is true that both in area and in population the Russian Empire was surpassed by the British Empire; but there was this important difference between the two cases. In the British Empire the overwhelming majority of the population consisted of subject coloured races; the British themselves formed merely a rather large oligarchy. In the Russian Empire, on the other hand, the white people were in a very great majority; the coloured population was relatively unimportant, not only in political and social status, but numerically. Not merely Russia in Europe, but the Russian Empire as a whole was as truly a white man's country as the United States of America. And over nine-tenths of the Slavonic peoples and a quarter of the entire white race dwelt within the far-flung frontiers of the Tsar's dominions.

The political condition of the Empire had been very unsettled throughout 1916, and by the beginning of 1917 the tension had become extreme. It will be remembered that in the Russian Parliament there were three parties, of which one consisted of a coalition of several groups, which had been originally quite separate (see *A R*, 1916, p. 257). These three parties were the Reactionaries, the "Progressive Bloc," and the Socialists. The Reactionary Party was formed out of a union of the extreme "Right" (popularly known as the "Black Hundreds") and a small ultra-conservative section of the Nationalists. The Reactionaries numbered about eighty deputies in the Duma, the Lower House of Parliament. The Progressive Bloc was by far the most important section of the Duma, and had been constituted through a coalition of the following parties: the majority of the Nationalists, the Centre, the Octobrists, the Progressives proper, the Constitutional Democrats (the so-called "Cadets"), and a small section of Labour politicians. About 250 members belonged to this Progressive Bloc, the party having gained adherents from both the extreme Right and the extreme Left during 1916. The extreme Left was a Socialist Party and had fewer than twenty representatives in the Duma.

Now the relations between the Imperial Government and the Progressive Bloc had been far from cordial ever since the military disasters of 1915, and during 1916 this hostility, although often kept below the surface, tended to increase rather than to abate. The Progressive Bloc desired to see far-reaching constitutional reforms carried out, involving the establishment of a system of government in which the Imperial Cabinet should be responsible not to the Tsar but to Parliament. These re-

forms were opposed by the Government and by the Emperor himself. Further, the Bloc politicians were enthusiastically in favour of the war, and were in all respects in sympathy with the aims of the great pro-war parties of France, Great Britain, and Italy. Now the Russian Reactionaries had never liked the war, and had always been averse from the close association of Russia with the democracies of Western Europe. The Imperial Government, especially M. Sazonoff, had honestly supported all war measures during the first few months of the conflict ; but having no faith in the ideals of democracy and no real bond of sympathy with the Western nations, save an opportunist antagonism to German chauvinism, when the course of the war became unfavourable to Russia they began to search for some means of withdrawing that Empire from a struggle which had brought it little save disaster , and thus the Government came to adopt a position in respect of foreign policy similar to, if not actually identical with that held by the Reactionary Party, with whom they had always been in agreement on domestic affairs. M. Sturmer, who was Prime Minister from February to November, 1916, was one of the strongest advocates of concluding peace with the Central Powers by negotiation, and it was said that he even favoured the extreme course of making a separate peace on behalf of Russia, without regard to the Pact of London, if the other Entente Governments could not be induced to adopt the policy of negotiation. But the hostility of the Duma drove M. Sturmer from office in November, his fall being contemporaneous with that of the Asquith Cabinet in Great Britain, a fact which was perhaps something more than a coincidence. M. Sturmer was succeeded by M. Trepoff. The latter had, however, a cold reception from the Duma, and it soon became clear that the substitution of M. Trepoff for M. Sturmer had brought about no serious modification either in foreign or in domestic policy. M. Sazonoff, the famous Foreign Minister, and one of the chief makers of the Triple Entente, had been forced to resign by M. Sturmer in July, and after his fall there was no equally powerful personality in the Government advocating a strong pro-war policy. On the contrary, the masterful Minister of the Interior, M. Protopopoff, who did not resign office at the time of M. Sturmer's fall, increased his influence in the Administration , and it was notorious that this statesman, although he had originally been a moderate Liberal (a member of the "Octobrist" group), was strongly in favour of concluding peace by negotiation—and separately if necessary.

It will be seen that the situation at the end of 1916 was an obviously unstable one. And the conflict between the Reactionary Government and the majority of the Duma was complicated by other factors. The party of the extreme Left, the Socialists, held internationalist and in many cases actually pacifist opinions, and had always been opposed to the war. Indeed, as pointed out in the last number of the ANNUAL REGISTER the

extremes of Russian politics met in their antagonism to the war, though the opposition in the two cases was based upon entirely dissimilar grounds. The position of the Russian Socialists in relation to the war was precisely comparable to that of the small groups of anti-war politicians, "advanced" thinkers of the extreme Left, in Italy, Great Britain,¹ and France. Now, as already stated, this party was numerically weak in the Duma, but as will be seen shortly it was by no means without influence in the country.

Again, as was to be expected in such a strictly monarchical country, the part played in events by the sovereign and by his private advisers was fully as important as the direct influence of the Ministers of State. Nicholas II, who was now forty-eight years of age, was a well-meaning but weak man. By disposition he was a lover of peace, but his vanity and vacillation had caused him to be led into the foolish war with Japan, and had nearly involved him in a conflict with Austria-Hungary at the time of the Bosnian crisis in 1908. He had promised constitutional liberties to his people, and yet had been keenly resentful of any practical curtailment of his rights as an autocrat. Essentially unstable, he had at first waxed enthusiastic over the Pan-Slavist crusade against the German Powers, but when he perceived that the campaign was not developing well, his ardour cooled. The Tsar, like the whole of the Russian bureaucracy and most of the aristocracy, cared nothing for either democracy or liberty, or for the ultimate objects of his Western Allies; and he lacked the strength of character necessary to carry through a war which was difficult, long, and wearisome. Hence the Emperor began to pay heed to those pro-Prussian influences which had been powerful in Russia for several generations, and the bonds of the Pact of London grew irksome.

And these pro-German influences were to be found in the very highest circles in the realm. The Tsaritsa had been a Princess of Hesse, and she retained a natural if not altogether creditable sympathy for the land of her birth. The Empress Alexandra became the centre of the Court clique which was working for peace by negotiation. The Tsar was naturally willing to listen to his wife's views, and he was also much under the influence of a certain Siberian monk named Rasputin, a strange character said to possess preternatural powers, and who had been largely instrumental in averting war with Austria-Hungary in 1908. Rasputin had been a favourite at the Imperial Court for many years. At the end of December the monk was murdered by the emissaries of the pro-war party, but by that time most of the leading personages in the Government and at the Court had come to favour the idea of peace, and nothing but fear of the Duma prevented the authorities from concluding an agreement with the Central Empires. It was

¹ Represented in Great Britain by the Union of Democratic Control and the

eloquent of the condition of Russia that no serious attempt was made to bring the murderers of Rasputin to justice

The opening of the year saw a further series of Ministerial changes, including the appointment of a new Premier. M. Trepoff resigned and Prince Nicholas Dmitrievitch Golitzin was appointed Prime Minister. Prince Golitzin was a Conservative statesman, nearly 70 years of age, who had been a successful governor of several provinces, including Tver, where he had accomplished much good work. The new Premier was thus an honest politician with a creditable record, but he was opposed to the new forces in Russia, and the fact that M. Trepoff's resignation was known to be due to his disagreements with M. Protopopoff, did not serve to make the change popular with the majority of the Duma. The other changes in the Government likewise had the effect of still further strengthening the ultra-Conservative element. Count Ignatieff, the much-respected Education Minister, resigned, and was succeeded by M. Kultchitsky. A few days after the resignation of the Prime Minister and Education Minister, the retirement of General Shuvaleff, the War Minister, was also announced. General Shuvaleff had distinguished himself by his courtesy to the Duma at the time of the crisis in the previous November, when M. Sturmer had been forced to retire. The new War Minister was General Bieliacoff. Immediately after this, on January 18, a ukase was issued postponing the opening of Parliament from January 25 until February 27.

This measure caused intense dissatisfaction in Petrograd, and the inevitable result was that the conflict of opinion between the rulers—in effect the Tsar, the Tsaritsa, and M. Protopopoff—and the middle classes, represented by the Duma, became even more acute than heretofore.

On January 21 the Tsar issued a rescript to his new Premier reviewing the political and military situation and indicating the immediate aims which he desired his Government to follow. He stated that the "tide of the war had now turned" and that he had no thought of concluding peace until complete and decisive victory had been attained. The first duty of the Government was, said the Emperor, to organise more efficiently the supply of provisions of all kinds for the army, and to improve the means of transport. It was necessary, he said, that the Houses of Parliament should give their support to the Government, and reciprocally that "all persons called upon to serve the State should act with goodwill, uprightness, and dignity towards the Legislative Institutions."

During February, the last month of Tsarism, there were no very startling events before the meeting of Parliament at the end of the month, although the storm was brewing below the surface. At the beginning of the month a Conference of the Allies was held in Petrograd, British, French, and Italian delegates assembling in the Russian capital. The head of the

British mission was Lord Milner, the other representatives including Lord Revelstoke and Mr Layton (Director of Munitions) The chief French delegates were M Doumergue (Colonial Minister) and General Castelnau, whilst Italy was represented by Signor Scialoia and others The delegates arrived at the end of January, and were received by the Tsar, and the first formal meeting of the Conference was held on February 1 It was understood that the object of the Conference was to attain greater co-ordination between the operations of the Entente armies on the different fronts Before leaving Russia Lord Milner visited Moscow.

On February 11 and 12 the Government suddenly issued warrants for the arrest of about twenty Labour members of the Central Committee of War Production, a body which, under the chairmanship of M Gutchkoff, had worked energetically in the provision of supplies of all kinds for the Army. The men who were arrested were accused of supporting a revolutionary movement which aimed at overthrowing the monarchy. The charge was denied at the time, but there is little doubt that it was true. These arrests caused great dissatisfaction in Liberal circles in Petrograd.

Both Houses of Parliament reassembled on February 27. The Prime Minister was not present in either chamber, but in the Duma, M. Rittitch, Minister of Agriculture, made a long statement on the Government's proposals for victualling the Army and the civil population, the problem of distributing food supplies having caused immense difficulty for many months. Early in March the scarcity of food in various parts of the Empire, especially in Petrograd, became acute. On March 10 the Government issued a statement explaining that the very heavy falls of snow had interrupted the regular distribution of cereals by railway, and urging the population to remember that with an improvement in the weather the train-service would again become regular and adequate. On the other hand, it was alleged by some of the adherents of the Bloc that M Protopopoff had deliberately withheld supplies of corn from Petrograd in order to produce such bitter dissatisfaction with war conditions as would cause the people to welcome the conclusion of peace by the Government. However that may have been, it was the scarcity of provisions, and especially of bread, in the capital which was the immediate cause of the outbreaks which led to the Revolution.

The first bread-riots took place in the capital on March 8, but were confined on this day to the Viborg quarter. On the same day the Tsar departed for one of his periodical visits to General Headquarters, the Emperor being, it will be remembered, the nominal Commander-in-Chief of the Army. It would appear from this that the Emperor was unaware of the imminent danger of a serious revolutionary movement. On the 9th the

the river, and many of the workers in the factories ceased work and joined the unruly crowds. Squadrons of Cossacks patrolled Petrograd, and on the 10th several regiments of Regular troops were also drafted into the city. In addition there were no fewer than 50,000 police in the capital, who were armed not only with rifles but with numerous machine-guns. It was on Saturday, the 10th, that the first serious collision between the police and the populace occurred, the police firing into a crowd opposite the Nicholas Station, and killing or wounding about fifty persons. The mobs were not to be pacified, however, either by the Government's conciliatory explanation of the shortage of bread, referred to above, or by this exhibition of violence by the police.

On the morning of March 11 (Feb 26 O S.) a proclamation was placarded in Petrograd, which finally precipitated the conflict, and which has, therefore, an interest for the historical student almost as great as that of the momentous German ultimatum to Russia issued on July 31, 1914. This proclamation, which was posted by order of the General commanding the Petrograd district, read as follows:—

“During the last few days disorders have taken place in Petrograd followed by violence and attempts upon the lives of soldiers and members of the police-force

“I forbid every kind of assembly in the streets. I warn the population of Petrograd that commands have been issued and have been repeated to the troops ordering them to use their arms and not to stop short of any measures in order to assure tranquillity in the capital.—Habalov, Lieut-General commanding the forces in the Petrograd Military District, February 25, 1917.”

Here was the voice of Tsarism, speaking the old language, speaking in the old familiar arrogant tone, but behind those commands there was now no longer the dread power which they had been wont to possess. The mobs ignored the proclamation and swarmed through the streets in tens of thousands. Regiment after regiment, when called upon to fire, hesitated, mutinied, broke up, and joined the proletarian crowds. It was the last time that that voice was heard in the world.

Whilst the population of Petrograd was thus hourly working itself more and more into a fever of revolutionary ardour, an allied but quite distinct movement was being set in motion in other social circles. The Russian Revolution was unique in history in that it was brought about by the synchronisation of two separate, different, and in some respects actually antipathetic, revolutionary movements. As explained at the beginning of this chapter there existed three parties in Russia, not two only. The Liberal Party, represented by the Duma majority, were bitterly hostile to the Tsar and his reactionary Government; and the Socialist Party, represented now by the mobs in Petrograd, were also burning with hatred of the Em-

peror and all his works. And the two parties struck their respective blows in the same place, and at the same time, but it cannot be said that they ever really acted together. The Liberals rode the storm of the proletarian revolt, but they did not guide it.

On the evening of March 9, M. Rodzianko, President of the Duma, called a special conference to deal with the question of food supplies, and this conference decided to recommend that the management of food supplies both in Petrograd and elsewhere be given over to the municipal authorities. On the following day M. Rittitch made a speech to the Duma agreeing to this proposal of M. Rodzianko, so far at least as the Petrograd district was concerned. The Minister's speech was well received, and the Duma instructed its Municipal Affairs Committee to draw up immediately the Bill necessary to give effect to this decision. The Duma then adjourned until the 13th, when, it was hoped, that the Bill would be considered. On Monday, the 12th, however, two ukases were issued from Imperial Headquarters suspending the sittings of the Council of Empire and of the Duma respectively, as from March 11, though it was proclaimed that the Houses would be permitted to reopen in April, "unless extraordinary circumstances supervened."

In the meantime the storm had broken in the streets of the capital. On Sunday all the trams ceased to run and no newspapers appeared. In the afternoon the police, in execution of General Habalov's command, fired upon the crowds in many localities, particularly in the Nevsky Prospect near the Kazan Cathedral, and opposite the Nicholas Station—at the same spot where the firing had occurred on the previous day. Hundreds of civilians were killed. In the afternoon, also, an officer of one of the Volynsky regiments, named Lashkevich, ordered his detachment to fire into the mob, but the soldiers refused to obey. Lashkevich, however, is said to have compelled one of his men to fire, and the shot appears to have killed a woman. Thereupon the Volynsky regiment marched back to barracks, disgusted with the repulsive character of the work which it had been called upon to do.

Early the following morning a detachment of police went to the barracks with orders to arrest the mutinous battalion, but the soldiers resisted, overcame the police, killed many of their own officers, including Lashkevich, and then joined the insurgent mobs in the streets. Shortly afterwards the Litovtsky regiment and several other regiments joined the Volynsky mutineers, and in the afternoon of this day, Monday the 12th, the mutiny became general amongst the rank and file of nearly all the battalions of the 40,000 troops stationed in the Capital. Most of the military officers endeavoured to stay the defection of their men, but found themselves powerless. The police remained loyal almost to a man, and in the morning of the 12th fighting became general throughout Petrograd between the

gendarmerie on the one hand and the mobs and the mutinous troops on the other hand. The hope of the loyalists was that they would be able to maintain their resistance until the arrival of troops from Tsarskoe Selo, upon whose loyalty they believed they could rely. During the course of the day, however, the battle—for such it had now become—went against the police, and by Monday evening the defenders of Tsarism had lost control of all the important points in Petrograd, save the Winter Palace, the Admiralty, and the telegraph and telephone stations.

The Imperial ukase suspending the Duma was published, as stated, on Monday the 12th, and it was this order, together with the anarchy reigning in Petrograd, which caused the Liberal leaders to take decisive action and to defy Nicholas II. For many months the Liberals had contemplated a comparatively mild "Court Revolution," which should depose Nicholas II., and place the Tsarevitch on the throne, with a suitable Regent during his minority. In this way it was thought that the aims of the Progressive Bloc could be attained, both as regards foreign policy and as regards constitutional reforms. The aim of these politicians was merely to get rid of this particular Tsar (not to abolish the monarchy) and to increase the powers of the Lower House of Parliament. It was this plan which the Parliamentary majority now decided to attempt to execute, and in pursuance of this object M. Rodzianko refused to obey the Emperor's order to close the Duma.

The President of the Lower House called an emergency meeting of that assembly on the 12th, all parties, except the Reactionaries, attending the gathering, in spite of the Tsar's ukase. An "Executive Committee of the Duma," with M. Rodzianko himself as chairman, was immediately formed, and it was announced that the object of this body was "to preserve order in Petrograd." The Liberals also hoped that the Council of Empire would disregard the Tsar's dismissal, but the President of the Upper House, M. Shtcheglovitoff, refused to convoke that chamber after the ukase had been issued.

At this point in the crisis the Imperial Government displayed a surprising lack of fortitude. The Premier and his associates appear to have become panic-stricken when the mutiny among the troops commenced, and as early as Monday afternoon Prince Golitzin telegraphed to M. Rodzianko that the entire Cabinet wished to resign office. A supplementary proclamation published by General Habalov on the morning of March 12, in which he ordered the workmen to return to the factories, was totally ignored. This failure of the Government to give the loyalists any decided lead had a discouraging effect upon the gendarmerie and the few battalions of loyal troops.

The battle in Petrograd continued throughout March 13. On the morning of that day the Telephone Station was captured, and on the same evening the Winter Palace and the Admiralty also fell to the Revolutionaries. These successes were not

gained without desperate fighting. Several Novgorod regiments held the Admiralty and they resisted the superior numbers of the mutineers with great bravery. A detachment of the Guards who were defending the Winter Palace also fought with the utmost courage.

On the morning of the 14th it became known that the troops at Tsarskoe Selo had gone over to the Revolution, and thus deprived of all hope of succour, the gendarmerie were unable to prolong their resistance. The battle was won by midday on Wednesday, although sporadic firing continued in many parts of the city until the following day, the 15th. The total number of casualties incurred during the fighting was estimated at about 6,000, and was probably above rather than below this figure.

Moscow, Odessa, the other large towns, and the army at the front joined the revolution almost without dissenting voices. The extraordinary ease with which the Revolution was accomplished was undoubtedly due in the main to its curious dual character. Each party interpreted the new movement after the manner in which it desired to interpret it, and without troubling to consider the conflicting character of the aims professed by the different groups of revolutionaries. The fact that the Executive Committee of the Duma nominally controlled the situation induced numerous classes of the population to desert Nicholas II., who would probably have supported that monarch if they had appreciated the true dimensions and significance of the proletarian revolt. The Grand-Dukes, the nobility, and the great Cossack communities were willing enough to get rid of the weak and unsuccessful Tsar, but the last thing they desired was the inauguration of a Socialist Republic. There were many who mistook the character of the Petrograd movement in March, and who imagined that the deposition of Nicholas involved only that mild Court Revolution which they approved, and these people did not discover their mistake until it was too late to dam the democratic flood.

The Executive Committee of the Duma, which was formed as already stated, on the 12th, formally took over the Government of the Russian Empire on the 14th. M. Rodzianko was chairman of this body, and it also included M. Miliukoff, M. Nekrasoff, M. Konovaloff, M. Vladimir Lvoff, M. Kerensky, M. Cheidze, Colonel Engelhart, and other statesmen. M. Kerensky was the leader of the Moderate Labour Party in the House, which had become attached to the Left wing of the Progressive Bloc during 1916. M. Cheidze was the leader of the Socialist Party in Parliament, and as such had now come to occupy an extremely important place in the nation's affairs. Colonel Engelhart was appointed Commandant of Petrograd.

This Executive Committee did not itself retain the supreme power. On the contrary, it immediately appointed another body, the "Provisional Government," which included, it is true, several members of the Executive Committee, but was never-

theless a separate and distinct council. The Provisional Government came into being on March 15, and was composed of the following statesmen.—

Prime Minister and Minister of Interior—Prince George Lvoff
Minister for Foreign Affairs—M. Miliukoff
Minister of Finance—M. Tereshtchenko
Minister of War and Marine—M. Gutschkoff
Minister of Education—M. Imanuiloff.
Minister of Agriculture—M. Shingareff
Minister of Railways—M. Nekrasoff.
Minister of Commerce and Industry—M. Konovaloff
Minister of Justice—M. Kerensky.
Minister of the Holy Synod—M. Vladimir Lvoff.
Comptroller-General—M. Godneff.

It will be noticed that M. Rodzianko was not a member of the new Government, and that M. Cherdze was also not included among the Ministers. The new Cabinet thus represented the Progressive Bloc only, whereas owing to the presence of M. Cherdze the Executive Committee of the Duma represented both the Bloc and the Socialists. Prince Lvoff was a highly respected statesman and administrator who held the position of President of the Zemstvo Union. He was a Constitutional Democrat. M. Miliukoff was leader of the Constitutional Democratic Party in the Duma, and was notable as an ardent supporter of the war against the Central Powers. The new War Minister was an Octobrist and a close friend of M. Miliukoff. M. Kerensky's presence in the Ministry was from the first a source of strength to the Government.

A few of the military officers in Petrograd actively assisted the rebellious troops from the commencement of the battle in the metropolis, but the majority of the officers did not come over to the revolutionary cause until the 14th, when they realised that the parliamentary leaders were helping and endeavouring to lead the movement, and also that the position of the Tsar was quite hopeless. The Grand-Duke Cyril Vladimirovitch signified his adhesion to the Duma on the 14th.

Whilst these events were taking place in Petrograd, the Emperor was hundreds of miles away at the General Headquarters of the Field Army, which were at Mohileff. As the crisis developed in Petrograd, M. Rodzianko repeatedly telegraphed to his sovereign urging him to call a new Government enjoying the confidence of the Duma and of the country. He telegraphed first on the Saturday, and then again on the 11th, reporting that shooting was taking place in the streets and that the formation of a new Government was imperatively necessary. On the morning of the 12th the President of the Duma telegraphed a final message warning the Tsar that unless he acted at once it would be too late, and "that the last hour had struck when the fate of the nation and of the dynasty would be decided." The weak monarch remained, however, obdurate against all these attempts to persuade him to adopt a moderate

and conciliatory course of action. He was an autocrat, and to his powers as such he obstinately clung. There would appear to be little doubt that if the Tsar had appointed a Parliamentary Ministry, even as late as March 10 or 11, the monarchy would have been saved and Russia would have proceeded quietly along the path of Constitutional Reform. Nicholas II took the opposite course, however, and his attempt to suspend the Duma had the consequences already described.

On March 14 the Emperor, having realised that his trust in the troops in Petrograd had been misplaced, set out from Headquarters, accompanied by General Voyekov and General Pavel with the intention of proceeding to the capital. He reached Pskov, but a few miles beyond that town he found that the country was already in the hands of the Revolutionaries, who thus controlled the railway line. The Emperor, therefore, ordered his train to return to Pskov. The hopeless character of his own position was now apparent even to the Tsar, and he and his advisers discussed the possibility of adopting the ultimate and most desperate remedy of opening the Minsk Front, and "re-establishing order" by means of German troops. The power which he had never known how to use had, however, fallen away from this monarch with dramatic suddenness, and even if he had attempted to carry out this project, which he did not, there is no doubt that the Commanders of the Army of Minsk would have refused to obey any such orders.

On March 15 M Gutchkov and M Shulgin arrived at Pskov for the purpose of demanding, on behalf of the Provisional Government, the Tsar's abdication. The new Government wished the Tsar to abdicate in favour of the Tsarevitch, with the Grand-Duke Michael as Regent, but this Nicholas refused to do, saying that he could not bear to be parted from his son. He agreed, however, to abdicate in favour of his brother Michael. Before signing the decree of abdication, which was drawn up for him, the Tsar was compelled to appoint Prince Lvoff as Prime Minister and also the Grand-Duke Nicholas as Commander-in-Chief, thus preserving a semblance of legality for the new Ministry. The text of the decree of abdication, which was signed at Pskov on the 15th, was as follows:—

"By the Grace of God, We, Nicholas II., Emperor of All the Russias, Tsar of Poland, Grand-Duke of Finland, etc., to all our faithful subjects be it known:—

"In the days of a great struggle against a foreign enemy, who has been endeavouring for three years to enslave our country, it pleased God to send Russia a further painful trial. Internal troubles threatened to have a fatal effect on the further progress of this obstinate war. The destinies of Russia, the honour of her heroic Army, the happiness of the people and the whole future of our beloved country demand that the war should be conducted at all costs to a victorious end. The cruel enemy is making his last efforts, and the moment is near when our valiant

Army, in concert with our glorious Allies, will finally overthrow the foe.

"In these decisive days in the life of Russia we have thought that we owed to our people the close union and organisation of all its forces for the realisation of rapid victory ; for which reason, in agreement with the Imperial Duma, we have recognised that it is for the good of the country that we should abdicate the Crown of the Russian State and lay down the supreme power. Not wishing to separate ourself from our beloved son, we bequeath our heritage to our brother, the Grand-Duke Michael Alexandrovitch, with our blessing for the future of the Throne of the Russian State. We bequeath it to our brother to govern in full union with the national representatives sitting in the legislative institutions, and to take his inviolable oath to them in the name of our well-beloved country.

"We call upon all faithful sons of our native land to fulfil their sacred and patriotic duty in obeying the Tsar at the painful moment of national trials and to aid him, together with the representatives of the nation, to conduct the Russian Empire in the way of prosperity and glory.

"May God help Russia."

After the signing of this historic document, Nicholas was permitted to leave Pskov and to return to the Army Headquarters, where he arrived on the 17th. Four days later, however, he was arrested by emissaries of the new Government and was conveyed to Tsarskoe Selo where the Empress and her children had been during the Revolution, and where they also were now kept under arrest.

The Grand-Duke Michael, a personage of considerable astuteness, and not troubled with excessive ambitions, was not prepared to fall in with the Parliamentarians' schemes. Being unable to attain the position of autocrat, he was not prepared to become the figure-head of a party, and was therefore only willing to mount the throne as the chosen leader of the Russian people as a whole. The Grand-Duke issued a manifesto to this effect on March 16, in which he stated that he was "firmly resolved to accept the supreme power only if this should be the desire of our great people" expressed by means of a universal plebiscite which would duly elect a Constituent Assembly with power to decide the new form of Government. Michael probably saw more clearly than the Duma leaders themselves how precarious the position of the middle-class Provisional Government really was, and he evidently had no desire to link his fortunes with those of M. Rodzianko. Thus it came to pass that on March 17 the world awoke to find that there was no Tsar in Slavdom.

During the days of the Revolution, telegraphic communication between Petrograd and the outside world was interrupted, and it was not until the morning of March 16 that the startling news was made known in Western Europe. It was at once

realised on all hands that the event which had occurred matched in importance even the war itself. History may even record that it was the greatest and most permanent of the war's effects. The extinction of Tsarism left a blank space in human society which seemed at first almost incredible. Russia's allies, freed by these events from the politic restraint which they had imposed upon themselves for the past two and a half years, and misreading the meaning of the new movement, hailed the Emperor's downfall with approbation. Tsarism passed out of existence amid a chorus of execration, and for once the press of Central and Western Europe was unanimous—neither allies nor foes supposing at the moment that the military situation would be seriously affected. And there is little doubt that this system of government which for 250 years had overshadowed such a large part of the Eastern hemisphere, deserved, in the main, the condemnation which Europe bestowed upon it. The slavery, the poverty, the ignorance, and the superstition of the masses, the cruelty and debauchery of many amongst the upper classes, the bloody pogroms of Jews, the corruption of the bureaucracy, the tyrannical suppression of natural political aspirations, the horrors of the prisons and of Siberian convict life—all these iniquities were legendarily associated with Russia in Western Europe, but it was a legend which was founded upon all too solid fact. Yet few human institutions are wholly evil. In many regions Russian despotism supplanted systems much more barbarous than itself. The Muscovite dominion was at its worst when in contact with higher civilisations, as in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic provinces. It was less bad when ruling Asiatics, and was probably at its best in its natural home of Great Russia. Tsardom was essentially different in origin and history from the Western moiety of Europe, and it is probable that few Occidentals properly comprehended its spirit. It is fair to recall that one school of thinkers, of whom Stephen Graham is the best known in England, believed that the millions of private lives which were lived out quietly under the ægis of the Autocracy gained in happiness, or at least in some elements of happiness, by the very absence of those restless ambitions which are customarily deemed almost essential to a tolerable existence in Western countries. Moreover, there is always something of greatness in a great state, even though it be a tyrannous state. The magnitude of the Russian Empire is one of the marvels of all history. Nor did that stupendous expansion take place under the most modern conditions, with modern facilities. The governance which moved on horseback from Warsaw to the Behring Sea, over 8,000,000 square miles of plain and forest-land, was no mean achievement. Yet when the best is said, it is not surprising that the other Europe, that Europe which came out of the Holy Roman Empire, breathed more freely because the Heir of Byzantium was dead.

The despotism having been destroyed, the new Government, which included very able men, began its work of administration and endeavoured to deal with the extraordinarily difficult problems which confronted it. The armies of powerful foreign foes were established deep within the Russian Empire, the State was nearly bankrupt, and parts of the country, owing to the bad means of communication, were suffering from serious scarcity of food, if not from actual famine. These difficulties were not, however, the worst obstacles to efficient government. The chief difficulty was the fundamental disunion in the Russian nation itself. The Liberal Government had no real control over the uprising of the masses. No sooner had the two dissimilar revolutionary movements, by their united strength, destroyed Tsarism, than the essential incompatibility of their aims became apparent. This disunity paralysed the Liberal Government from the outset.

The mobs in Petrograd formed various district committees as early as March 12, and on March 14 a central proletarian body was constituted which was called "The Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates". The next day this Council or "Soviet" issued an "Order No 1" which was held by some to be largely responsible for the loss of discipline in the Russian Army, although it was almost as much the symptom as the cause of that indiscipline. The purport of Order No. 1 was that the Army was rightfully subject to the Soviet rather than to the Duma, that the soldiers of every battalion should elect a committee to supervise the administration of the battalion, that the committees (not the officers) should have control of the arms, and finally that the orders of the new War Ministry, just established by the Duma, were only to be obeyed if they did not conflict with the resolutions of the Soviet. It will be seen that the Soviet was thus arrogating to itself many of the functions of Government, and this duality of control was fatal to the maintenance of discipline in the Army, as also to the re-establishment of order in the country. As already related a provisional working agreement was reached between the Government and the Soviet, for there was no lack of goodwill among the more moderate elements on both sides, and the Government agreed to the Soviet's condition that preparations should be begun forthwith for the summoning of that great "Constituent Assembly" which should decide the future Constitution and fundamental laws of the Russian State. The constant friction which subsequently occurred was caused partly by the impracticable character of many of the Soviet's schemes, including the control of regiments by elected committees of the uncommissioned ranks, and partly by the mutual animosities of the more extreme politicians on either side. The extreme Socialists demanded an immediate peace, in conjunction with Russia's allies if possible, but if those Powers refused to make terms, then a separate peace without regard to the Pact of

London. On the other hand, considerable dissension was caused by the extreme members of the pro-war party, headed by M. Miliukoff. This politician advocated an extreme annexationist policy,¹ which went far beyond the scheme for the reorganisation of Europe on the basis of nationalities as authoritatively propounded in England; and the protests, which, as will be seen, the Soviet made against a policy of "annexations" were directed primarily against the views which M. Miliukoff was known to hold, not against the French and British Governments. The Socialists were, however, to a large extent ignorant of the principles underlying Franco-British policy, and it was imperfectly appreciated in Russia that M. Miliukoff's special views had no support in England, and little in France.

A general manifesto issued by the Provisional Government on March 16 stated that the following were the fundamental principles of its policy:—

1. An immediate and general amnesty for all political and religious offences, including terrorist acts, military revolts, and agrarian crimes.
2. Freedom of speech, of the Press, of association and labour organisations, and the freedom to strike, with an extension of these liberties to officials and troops in so far as military and technical conditions permit.
3. The abolition of all social, religious, and national restrictions.
4. Immediate preparations for the summoning of a Constituent Assembly which, with universal suffrage as a basis, shall establish the governmental régime and the Constitution of the country.
5. The substitution for the police of a national militia, with elective heads and subject to the local government bodies.
6. Communal elections to be carried out on the basis of universal suffrage.
7. The troops that have taken part in the revolutionary movement shall not be disarmed, but they are not to leave Petrograd.
8. While severe military discipline must be maintained on active service, all restrictions upon soldiers in the enjoyment of social rights granted to other citizens are to be abolished.

On March 15 the diplomatic representatives of Great Britain, France, and Italy entered into communication with the new authorities and recognised them as the *de facto* Government of Russia.

On March 17 M. Miliukoff, on behalf of the Government, issued a long statement to the representatives of Russia in foreign capitals. After describing the events of the Revolution,

¹ M. Miliukoff had advocated cutting up Central Europe in all directions, with the annexation of certain purely German parts of the German Empire (such as East Prussia and all the territory west of the Rhine), and also the carving of a huge corridor through the purely Magyar country of Hungary in order to link up the new Czecho-Slovak State with the new Jugo-Slav kingdom.

and referring to the above manifesto setting out the Ministerial policy, the communication stated that "in the domain of foreign policy the Cabinet, in which I am charged with the portfolio of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, will remain mindful of the international engagements entered into by the fallen régime, and will honour Russia's word."

On April 9 another manifesto was issued, this time bearing the signature of Prince Lvoff himself. After blaming the old régime for the existing plight of Russia, the Premier declared that "the Government deems it to be its right and duty to declare now that free Russia does not aim at dominating other nations, at depriving them of their national patrimony, or at occupying by force foreign territories; but that its object is to establish a durable peace on the basis of the rights of nations to decide their own destiny. The Russian nation does not lust after the strengthening of its power abroad at the expense of other nations. Its aim is not to subjugate or to humiliate anyone. . . But the Russian nation will not allow its fatherland to emerge from the great struggle humiliated and weakened in its vital forces."

The manifesto bore obvious signs of the influence of the Socialists, and an All-Russia Conference of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates which assembled in Petrograd on April 13 passed a resolution to much the same effect, that is, the conference (by a majority of about 6 to 1) was pro-war, with the proviso that the aims of the war should not be aggressive. The attitude of this conference towards internal affairs was very extreme. A resolution was passed on April 17 demanding the total suppression of all classes and titles, a radical reorganisation of the system of local government, and the confiscation of all lands belonging to the Crown or the Church (including monasteries), and their transference to the use of the peasantry. At the end of April the Government took action which appeared to modify the meaning of the manifesto of April 9. M. Miliukoff sent copies of this memorandum to the Allied Powers, but sent also an explanatory note, signed by himself, in which he declared the complete agreement of the new Russia with the well-known war-aims of the other Entente Powers, and said that "the nation's determination to bring the world-war to a decisive victory" had been accentuated by the Revolution. The Foreign Minister's note immediately caused a storm in Russia. The Soviet had evolved a phrase that the war ought to be concluded on the principle of "No Annexations and No Indemnities". There was no reference to any such principle in M. Miliukoff's note, and his affirmation that the war should be waged to "decisive victory" gave offence to the Socialists, who organised demonstrations of protest in the capital. The Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates met the Government in a joint sitting on May 4, and the Government agreed to dispatch another note to the Allies

reaffirming the passages in the manifesto of April 9 which have been quoted above, thus, in fact, almost flatly contradicting M. Miliukoff's note. The Soviet then passed a vote of confidence in the Government. It is quite possible that the opposition to M. Miliukoff's note was very largely due to personal antagonism to the Minister himself, although he had in no way put forward his own private theories (which as already stated went beyond the recognised aims of the Allies) in the note. That a real contradiction existed between the manifesto of April 9 and the note dated May 1 there is no doubt. And there is also little doubt that the note rather than the manifesto represented the candid opinions and desires of the non-Socialist parties, although other members of the Government were much more discreet in compromising with the Soviet than was the Foreign Minister.

After this incident it became obvious that having regard to the influence that the Soviet wielded in the country the retention of M. Miliukoff in the Cabinet was impossible, and that Minister resigned. Moreover, the middle-class parties realised that they were not powerful enough to govern alone, and Prince Lvoff issued an invitation to the Socialists to share office. After considerable discussion the offer was accepted, and a Coalition Government was formed. Prince Lvoff remained Premier and the new Ministry was composed as follows:—

Prime Minister and Minister of Interior—Prince Lvoff.
Foreign Minister—M. Tereshchenko.
Minister of War and Marine—M. Kerensky.
Minister of Finance—M. Shingareff.
Minister of Railways—M. Nekrasoff.
Minister of Commerce—M. Konovaloff.
Minister of Agriculture—M. Tchernoff.
Minister of Labour—M. Skobeleff.
State Controller—M. Godneff.
Minister of Education—M. Manuloff.
Minister of the Holy Synod—M. Vladimir Lvoff.
Minister of Justice—M. Pelevinezoff.
Minister of Posts and Telegraphs—M. Tseretelli.
Minister of Food Supplies—M. Petchekhonoff.
Minister of Public Relief—Prince Shakhevsky.
Minister for Constituent Assembly—Professor Grimm.

Of the new Ministers the most important were MM. Skobeleff and Tseretelli, who were prominent leaders of the Soviet. Professor Grimm of Petrograd University was entrusted with the task of making preparations for convoking the Constituent Assembly.

The new Coalition Ministry immediately issued a long declaration of policy, stating *inter alia*, that "in its foreign policy the Provisional Government, rejecting, in concert with the entire people all thought of a separate peace, adopts openly as its aim the re-establishment of a general peace which shall not tend towards either domination over other nations, or the seizure of their national possessions, or the violent usurpations of their territories—a peace without annexations or indemnities, and based upon the rights of nations to decide their own affairs." It was

further stated that the Government would take steps to bring about an agreement between all the Allies on the lines of the declaration of April 9. The remainder of the declaration dealt with domestic affairs.

On May 10, a few days before the formation of the Coalition Ministry, a meeting of the Duma, together with members of the First and Second Dumas, was held, this date being the anniversary of the opening of the First Duma. M. Rodzianko, M. Gutschkoff, and others made speeches declaring that it was necessary to continue the war to a victorious conclusion.

On May 20 Prince Lvoff issued an appeal urging the Army to break the armistice which had by this time been established on the Front, through the initiative of the Russian common soldiers themselves. The armistice, said the Premier, was incompatible with the honour and dignity of Russia.

The Soviet also issued an appeal to the troops explaining that although the war had not been desired by the people, but had on the contrary been "begun by Emperors and capitalists of all countries," yet a separate peace would be disastrous for Russia and for the world, since it would give German Imperialism the opportunity to defeat first the Western Allies and subsequently Russia herself, and urging the troops to recollect that the men with whom they were fraternising were not a revolutionary army, but the obedient serfs of "William and Charles, Emperors and capitalists."

From this time onwards for several months the attention of the country was concentrated upon the efforts of the Government and the Soviet to secure a general peace. The Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates took the initiative in proposing the summoning at Stockholm of an international peace conference of all Socialist parties of all countries. And they addressed a demand to all Governments that passports for this conference should be granted to all Socialist parties and groups. The Government, on their part, endeavoured, but without any real success, to induce the French, British, and Italian Governments to revise the war-aims of the Entente on the basis of the principle of no annexations and no indemnities. The truth was, of course, that the war-aims of the three Western Powers were incompatible with this formula. In France, Great Britain, and Italy a peace involving a return to the *status quo ante bellum* would have been regarded as almost tantamount to defeat, and the peoples of those countries did not consider that the war had been caused by "the capitalists of all countries." The avowed aim of the Western Powers was to cut off certain territories of the Central Empires inhabited by peoples other than German and Magyar, thus giving those peoples independence and, at the same time, weakening the military power of the Germans and Magyars. Thus there existed a real difference of opinion between Russia and the other three Powers. Some attempts were made at compromise. M.

Tereshtchenko indicated that he thought that an exception to the new formula ought to be made in the case of Alsace-Lorraine, whilst French and British Ministers made it clear that if Russia did not wish to annex Constantinople, nobody thought of compelling her to seize it. The Moderate Socialist Party, which was in a majority in the Soviet and was led by M. Cheidze, M. Skobeleff, and M. Tseretelli, had arisen out of the Extreme Left Party in the Duma. And the attitude of this party had always corresponded, not with that of the majorities in Great Britain, France, and Italy, but with that of the dissentient minorities—with the views of the Official Socialists of Italy, and of the Union of Democratic Control and the Independent Labour Party in Great Britain.¹ It was thus not surprising that no agreement was reached. In this way the informal discussion dragged on, and the position remained unchanged for seven months and more. The Russian Government remained loyal to the Pact of London, but at the same time² disapproved of their Allies' aims and were unable to induce their armies to act up to the spirit of the Pact.

In the meanwhile rapid evolution took place in party politics. The Revolution completely destroyed all the parties of the old "Progressive Bloc" except the Constitutional Democrats and M. Kerensky's Labour group. The latter was absorbed into the Soviet. The Duma, always an undemocratic body, still existed, but only as a corpse. The Socialist Party, which had hitherto appeared to be minute, emerged from the convulsion as by far the strongest party, and before long it split up into three divisions. These were the Social Democrats, the Socialist Revolutionaries, and the "Bolsheviks," the word "bolshevik" meaning majority,³ and the origin of the name being that these extremists had been in a majority at a certain Socialist Conference several years previously. The differences between the first two divisions were not vital, but the Bolsheviks, who were at first only a small minority in the Soviet, advocated quite distinct ideas. They proposed that Russia should demand a general peace on the basis of no annexations and no indemnities, and if the Western Powers did not agree to this, that a separate peace should be made by Russia. The Bolsheviks included actual Anarchists, and one of their leaders, a certain M. Lenin, was a revolutionary who had been living in Switzerland before the Revolution, and had then returned to Russia across Germany, with the permission of the German authorities. The history of the summer is the story of the struggle between the Moderate Socialists and this new party of violent extremists. The unhappy remnant of the Progressive Bloc never possessed any serious influence.

¹ See speech by M. Cheidze reported on p. 260 of A.R., 1916.

² The non-Socialist members of the Cabinet no doubt privately agreed with the Allies, but they were completely overawed by the Soviet.

³ The term "Maximalist," often used in the English Press, was an erroneous translation of Bolshevik.

In June an election was held for the municipal councils of Petrograd on the basis of universal suffrage. The result was an overwhelming victory for the Moderate Socialists, the different sections of the party (the Labour Party, the Social Democrats, and the Revolutionary Socialists) fighting the election in alliance. The Moderate Socialists secured 507,982 votes, the Constitutional Democrats 166,309, and the Bolsheviks 117,760.

In May an assembly of "peasants' delegates" was held in Petrograd. The opinions expressed at the conference were not dissimilar from those of the Soviet, but how far these views really represented the mind of the peasantry it is difficult to say. There had, of course, been no general election; and the peasants, who constituted, of course, the vast majority of the nation, were only just emerging into political consciousness.

At the end of May the Soviet published an earnest appeal to the Allied Governments to reply definitely "Yes" or "No" to the question whether they accepted the formula of "No Annexations and No Indemnities," and indicated that an affirmative reply should be followed by the opening of pourparlers with the enemy. Revolutionary Russia, it was declared, would not sacrifice a single soldier to repair "historic injustices"—a reference, apparently, to such questions as Alsace-Lorraine, the Trentino, Bohemia, etc.

Early in June the German Government made a proposal to Russia to conclude a separate armistice, but this suggestion was unequivocally rejected both by the Government and by the Soviet. Over the greater part of the Front, however, the soldiery had, as already stated, established an informal armistice on their own initiative.

Constant appeals were sent out by the Soviet urging the working classes of all countries to join them in their efforts to secure a general democratic peace, and to send delegates to the proposed international peace conference at Stockholm.

The British reply to M. Miliukoff's note on war-aims was published in June. This stated that the British Government had not entered the war with ideas of conquest, but that Great Britain now aimed at liberating populations, including all the Poles, oppressed by alien tyranny. The reply also said that if the Russian Government so desired, the British Government were quite ready, in conjunction with the other Allies, to examine, and if necessary to revise, the agreements which had been concluded between the Allied Powers.

Another and more complete All-Russian Congress of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates was held in Petrograd during the latter half of June, M. Cheidze being chairman. M. Kerensky, M. Tseretelli, M. Lenin, and most of the other prominent Socialists spoke at these meetings. The Congress passed resolutions abolishing the Duma and the Council of the Empire, the objection to the Duma being that it was likely to become the "centre of a counter-revolutionary movement." The Duma

then held a meeting and passed a resolution declaring that it refused to be abolished. A Congress of the Cossacks of All Russia which was being held at the same time sent a telegram supporting the Duma's action.

The inactivity of the Russian Army was keenly resented by the more warlike sections of the nation, and was felt to be a national humiliation. In the fighting in July, in some cases whole regiments were formed of commissioned officers, who faced certain death in order to set an example to the demoralised soldiery. Horrible atrocities were committed by the more extreme revolutionaries, particularly by the men of the Baltic Fleet. Many naval officers were arrested and tried by their own men, and some, having been condemned by revolutionary tribunals, were done to death by being dropped through holes in the ice then covering the Gulf of Finland. In remote country districts women and children of the upper classes were murdered by deserters from the Army. Even the patriotic sections of the population displayed a tendency towards extremes which were almost neuropathic, for the Russian nation resembled a man whose mind is reeling under overstrain—the strain of unsuccessful war. One of the most painful and repulsive of these abnormalities was the formation of battalions of women-soldiers, so-called "Battalions of Death," whose existence, it was hoped, would shame the Bolshevik soldiery into action. These female battalions, the members of which were possessed by neurotic enthusiasm, were actually allowed to face the German guns, and many of the hapless women were killed.

As related elsewhere, the Russian Army took the offensive again at the end of June, but as soon as it encountered determined resistance its discipline broke down utterly, and the troops fled in panic. The Government ordered the disbandment of the most mutinous regiments, but the Bolsheviks in Petrograd demonstrated against this order, and the riots thus created were not quelled without serious bloodshed, 500 persons being killed and wounded in the streets. Some of the non-Socialists retired from the Cabinet in disgust on July 16, and M. Kerensky became Premier in a new Government, consisting mainly of Moderate Socialists. During the next three weeks constant changes of personnel occurred, and at one time M. Kerensky himself resigned, but consented to resume the leadership on being requested to do so by all parties except the Bolsheviks. He was supported by M. Tereshchenko (Foreign Affairs), M. Savinkoff (War), M. Nekrassoff (Finance), M. Tchernoff (Agriculture), M. Skobelev (Labour), M. Avksentieff (Interior), M. Nikitin (Posts), and other Ministers. M. Tseretelli was not a member of the new Cabinet.

A National Conference of politicians representing all the more important bodies in the country, including the Bolsheviks, was held at Moscow in August, being opened by M. Kerensky on the 25th. In his opening speech the Premier said that he

had to warn the gathering that the position of Russia was extremely grave, but he said that the Provisional Government would put down with severity any attempts at violence by the counter-revolutionary forces, or by the Anarchists. M. Prokopovitch, Minister of Commerce, in a speech made on the same day, stated that the cost of war in the first year was 5,300,000,000 roubles (about 530,000,000£. at pre-war rates of exchange), in the second year 11,200,000,000 roubles, and in the third year 18,000,000,000 roubles, whilst the total income of the Russian Empire in 1913 was only 16,000,000,000 roubles. General Korniloff arrived on the 26th, and the following day he delivered a speech in which he declared that the enemy was threatening Riga, and that unless prompt and severe means were taken to restore the discipline of the Army "the road to Petrograd would be opened wide." Speeches were also delivered by M Cheidze, M. Rodzianko, and M Miliukoff.

During September and October the political situation in Petrograd was undergoing a fundamental change owing to the non-success of the Kerensky Government in their efforts to induce the Allied Powers to modify their war-aims in accordance with the principles advocated by the Soviet. In the early days of the Revolution, a large majority of the Socialists had been opposed to a separate peace; but as time dragged on and conditions of life in Russia became worse and worse, and yet no reconciliation was reached between Russian and Western aims, opinion began to veer to the Bolshevik side, until finally, in November, the masses were clamouring loudly for peace, peace immediately, and peace at almost any price. The final outbreak, which swept Kerensky away, was really nothing more than the consummation of the Revolution. It was merely the completion of the severance from the policies of the old Russia, in foreign as in domestic affairs. The extreme revolutionaries were determined to tear their country free from the alliances of the Tsarism, and they cared no more for the interests of the Allies than they did for the welfare of the nobility whose estates they were seizing.

None realised more clearly than did Kerensky himself the instability of his own position, and during his last two months of power he adopted desperate expedients to save the situation. The events of September and October, in respect of their influence upon the history of Russia, were not important. The non-Socialist classes were quite as alive to the possibility of an ultimate Bolshevik triumph as were the moderate Socialists, and they made more than one attempt to forestall this eventuality by endeavouring to carry through a *coup d'état* on their own behalf. General Korniloff was the author of the most notable of these attempts. After the fall of Riga, he suddenly threw over his obligations to the Petrograd Government and declared that so long as the Soviets interfered in military matters, the safety of the country could not be secured. Korni-

loff proceeded at once to move troops on Petrograd, and amongst Generals and officers he enjoyed wide support. But he completely miscalculated the strength of the different forces at work in the country. When his troops met those of the Government, they commenced at once not to fight but to talk; and the result of the talking was that the General's troops deserted to Kerensky's side. The movement then came to a sudden and somewhat ignominious end, and the would-be dictator soon had to surrender to the Government.

M Kerensky, who had made himself commander-in-chief during the Korniloff "rebellion," considered that it was necessary to strengthen the existing régime against the possibility of further reactionary and monarchist conspiracies. On September 15, therefore, the Premier issued a manifesto declaring formally that Russia was now a republican state. It will be remembered that it had originally been proposed that the decision on the question of Russia's form of Government should be left to the Constituent Assembly. During the next six weeks constant changes were made in the personnel of the Administration, though M Kerensky remained Premier and M Tereshchenko continued at the Foreign Office. The Government were forced to search about for popular support, or for the appearance of popular support, although no steps were taken to hold the elections for the Constituent Assembly, which, if it had come into existence, would have wielded some real authority. A so-called Democratic Conference, representing many working-class interests in the country, met in Petrograd at the end of September; and in October a body known as the "Interim Parliament" was constituted. The Interim Parliament was composed partly of delegates from the Democratic Conference and partly of non-proletarian elements. None of these devices served to stay the flow of the tide in the Bolshevik direction.

During September considerable interest was aroused in Russia by the trial of General Sukhomlinoff, who had been War Minister at the outbreak of war and for nearly a year afterwards. The general was charged with high treason. M. Rodzianko, M. Miliukoff, and others were called as witnesses, and gave evidence proving the appalling incompetence of the War Minister, and in particular his culpable failure to provide the armies with munitions in the early months of 1915. It also appeared that he had given very large orders for shells to firms which were quite unable to supply the quantities required within the limited time available, the reason for this extraordinary action being that the Minister had an interest of one kind or another in the firms concerned. The part of the evidence which caused the most interest was, however, that given by the accused himself in regard to events in St. Petersburg during the last momentous days before the outbreak of the war. Sukhomlinoff told an extraordinary story, and his state-

ments were confirmed from the witness-box by General Januskevitch. It appeared that the decree of general mobilisation was signed by the Tsar on July 29. Later in the day the Tsar received from the German Emperor a telegram urging him not to proceed with military measures, lest his (the German Emperor's) position as mediator between St. Petersburg and Vienna should be undermined. The Tsar was impressed by the telegram and immediately telephoned to General Sukhomlinoff and to General Januskevitch (then Chief of the General Staff) ordering them to cancel the general mobilisation and to proceed only with the partial mobilisation in the districts bordering upon Austria. The two generals then consulted one another, and decided to disobey the Tsar's order, and to allow the general mobilisation to proceed. On the following day, Sukhomlinoff deceived the Tsar as to the actual position of affairs, although the Tsar subsequently learned the truth, and does not appear to have been much incensed at discovering that he had been deceived.¹

After a prolonged trial Sukhomlinoff was acquitted on the charge of deliberately conspiring to assist the enemy, but was found guilty on less serious charges of corruption, and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment.

By the end of October the position of the Kerensky Government had become desperate. The question of food-supplies was again causing acute difficulty, both in Petrograd itself and in most parts of Northern Russia. The populace were now almost wholly with M. Lenin and the other Bolshevik leaders. The Bolsheviks secured control of the Petrograd Soviet, and of the Soviets in Moscow and other large towns. On November 7 a *coup d'état* was carried through in Petrograd. A naval detachment acting under M. Lenin's orders, seized the Official Petrograd Telegraph Agency, the State Bank, and the Marie Palace, where the so-called Interim Parliament had been sitting. On the following day all the other important buildings in the capital were seized. M. Kerensky fled, and M. Tereshtchenko was arrested. M. Lenin became chief of the new Government, or "Commissaries of the People," as they styled themselves. Proclamations were issued by the Petrograd Soviet declaring that the policy of the new Revolutionary Committee included (1) the offer of an immediate democratic peace; (2) the transference of private landed estates to the peasants; (3) the concentration of all power in the hands of the Soviets, pending, (4) the convocation, at an early date, of the Constituent Assembly. A certain M. Trotsky, who had been President of the Petrograd

¹ The significance and importance of this revelation were a matter of acute controversy in England and elsewhere. On the one side it was urged that the generals' confessions proved the existence of a clique in St. Petersburg who were aiming at war. On the other side it was contended that the revelation had no great practical importance, since the German Government (so it was contended) would have regarded even the partial mobilisation as a *casus belli*. M. Sazonoff seems to have been, at least to some extent, in collusion with the two generals.

Soviet since the Bolsheviks had secured a majority on that body, became Foreign Minister in the new Lenin Cabinet M Kerensky escaped from the capital, and hastily raised a small army He marched on Petrograd, but was met by a larger Bolshevik force, and serious fighting ensued outside the capital. Kerensky's adherents were defeated and dispersed, but he himself once more avoided capture. Cossack risings also took place in the south, but these exercised no serious influence on the situation, and by the middle of November the Bolshevik Government were well established During the remaining six weeks of the year the political situation was dominated by the negotiations for an armistice, and for peace, into which the Lenin Government immediately entered without any reference to the Allies, or former Allies, of the Russian Empire An account of these negotiations will be found elsewhere (see *The European War*, Chap. III). At the same time, however, the Bolsheviks set in motion the long-discussed elections for the Constituent Assembly By the end of the year about half the assembly (*i.e.*, about 400 members) had been elected, the moderate Socialists being, thus far, in a clear majority over all other parties combined.

M. Trotsky, shortly after assuming office, proved conclusively that Russia's divorce from the Entente was now complete, by publishing certain secret and confidential treaties which had been entered into by Russia and several of the other Allied Powers. The most important of these treaties was one concluded between the Russian and French Governments in February, 1917, and which related to the delimitation of the Western frontiers of Germany in the event of the Entente being victorious It was agreed between the two Powers that France should (1) annex Alsace-Lorraine, (2) annex the mining district of the Saar valley, and (3) erect the remainder of the German territory west of the Rhine into an autonomous buffer state, severed from the German Empire economically as well as politically—the object of this last clause being to protect France and Belgium against future invasion. In return for the Russian support of these French claims, the Russian Government were to be allowed a free hand in delimiting the Eastern frontiers of Germany and Austria-Hungary

It may be mentioned here that after the publication of this treaty the British Government expressly declared that they had not been a party to it, and had not even been consulted in the matter It may also be emphasised that the treaty did not provide either for the actual or disguised annexation to France of all Germany west of the Rhine, as untruly represented in Berlin.

In the foregoing description of Russian affairs, attention has been mainly directed to the course of events in Petrograd; but no sooner had the Tsar been deposed than a tendency to establish local governments became apparent in many parts of the Empire. In most cases the aim of the governing committees

which were established was merely to form provincial governments, owing general allegiance to the Executive in Petrograd, but in the case of Finland complete sovereign independence was demanded and ultimately attained. In other regions, however, local executives were established, and since these acquired a semi-independent status, it came about that at the end of the year the Petrograd Government was immediately responsible only for Great Russia. In August a conference of delegates from all the Siberian provinces met at Tomsk and made arrangements for the summoning of an autonomous Siberian Parliament; but much the most important of these semi-independent Executives was that of *Ukrainia*, which was founded at Kieff. Although *Ukrainia* (otherwise known as Little Russia or Ruthenia) had been denied any separate political institutions under the Tsars, it had never lost completely its individuality and national characteristics, and this resuscitation of a state which had been submerged for two and a half centuries was an interesting phenomenon. The Ukrainian council was known as the "Rada," and this body announced that *Ukrainia* would consist of the following "governments". Kieff, Podolia, Volhynia, Chernigoff, Poltava, Kharkoff, Ekaterinoslav, Kherson, and Taurida, without the Crimea. Kursk, Kholm, and Voronesh were to be incorporated if their respective inhabitants themselves so desired *Ukrainia*, as also the other provinces which were claiming autonomy, duly elected delegates to the All-Russian Constituent Assembly. The only exception was Finland, which, as already stated, cut itself loose from Russia altogether.

At the end of the year it was impossible to foretell whether what had been the Russian Empire would be reorganised into a stable federation of republican states or would break up, as the Roman Empire broke up fifteen centuries ago, into a number of independent nations taking divergent paths. The vast territories were in a condition not far removed from anarchy. A great system of governance had vanished utterly from the earth, and something had been lost with it. But amidst the unparalleled discords of the new era, a note of true political idealism could be distinguished, which was never to be heard in the days of the Tsars.

It remains to be recorded that the Republican authorities removed Nicholas II. to Siberia, and imprisoned him in the Abalak Monastery, near Tobolsk. And although universal suffrage was established, the family of Romanoff were expressly disfranchised. Thus it came to pass that he who had been Tsar of All the Russias possessed no vote, and had less influence in the affairs of men than the meanest of his peasants.

II. FINLAND.

The union of Finland with Russia was a purely personal bond, and in law resided exclusively in the fact that the two

countries were ruled by the same monarch. This legal position was not abrogated by the various attempts at russification which had been made from time to time. Thus when the Russian monarchy was destroyed many persons in Finland eagerly anticipated the attainment of complete independence by their country. This was opposed, however, by the Russian Provisional Government, both under Prince Lvoff and under M. Kerensky, although the latter was willing to grant wide autonomous powers. The Russian Government ordered the dissolution of the Finnish Diet in August, owing to the recalcitrant behaviour of the assembly. The Elections were held at the beginning of October, and the parties were returned in the following numbers: Social Democrats, 95; Bourgeois Bloc, 65; Agrarians, 22; Swedish Party, 18. In October a measure was introduced in the Diet establishing the independence of Finland from Russia in all matters except foreign relations, but after the Bolsheviks came into power in Petrograd, another Bill was introduced by Senator Svinkufvud, declaring the absolute and sovereign independence of the Finnish Republic. The Bill passed in December, and at the end of the year the independence of the Republic was recognised by Sweden and by France, and the acquiescence of the new Petrograd Ministry was assured.

III. POLAND.

It will be remembered that in November, 1916, the two Kaisers had issued proclamations establishing an independent or semi-independent Polish state. The new state was to include the territory of what had been Russian Poland, but not Austrian or Prussian Poland, and it was therefore comparable to Napoleon's "Grand Duchy of Warsaw," and did not truly represent a resuscitation of the Poland of history. The exact boundaries of the proposed state were not defined, however, and although it was announced that independent Poland would be a monarchy, no sovereign was actually nominated in November, 1916, and up to the end of 1917 no official statement was published in regard to this question. Little news of the country reached England during the year. Up to the time of the harvest the scarcity of food was so acute as to amount almost to famine, and thousands of people died from the indirect, if not from the direct effects of privation. The German and Austro-Hungarian authorities, in accordance with their original announcement at the time of the foundation of the state, set to work to raise a Polish Army of volunteers. The nucleus of this force consisted of the Polish Legion, a corps of Russian Poles which had fought under Austrian auspices since the early days of the war. The total number of volunteers secured is not known at the time of writing. The Central Powers do not appear to have conscribed the Poles for military service, but

both men and women were compelled to undertake civil work, often in districts remote from their homes.

After the country was conquered in 1915, it was divided for administrative purposes into a German sphere, governed from Warsaw, and an Austro-Hungarian sphere, governed from Lublin. A Polish State Council was, however, established, and a gradual transference of functions from the two foreign governors to the native council took place. An additional "Regency Council" was also established in September, and this was composed of three personages, the Archbishop of Warsaw (Mgr. A. von Kakowski), the Mayor of Warsaw (Prince Lubomirski), and M. Josef von Ostrowski. The Regency Council did not supersede, but collaborated with the older Provisional State Council.

This State Council was subsequently converted into a definite Polish Cabinet, the first Prime Minister being Count Tarnowski. In November, however, Count Tarnowski resigned, and the Regency Council appointed M. Jan Kucharczewski, a well-known historian, as Premier. M. Kucharczewski stated that a Polish Army would be speedily constituted, and that any attempt to build up a Polish Government or Army outside Poland would be opposed both by the Regency Council and by himself. The fate of Poland was of course one of the most important subjects under discussion at Brest-Litovsk.

IV. TURKEY.

The position of the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the year was unprecedented. The great Moslem state which had been an independent Power, and at one time a great and all too formidable Power, had now fallen to a very large extent under the influence and control of the Hohenzollern Empire, so much so that Turkey was now little better than a German Protectorate. In particular, the military organisation of the country had been brought under the supervision of Germans, and many German officers had been given appointments on the Ottoman Staff. Whilst the Turkish Empire gained in this manner by being permeated by the military abilities of Prussia, and was thus able to defend itself against external enemies much more effectively than it could have done without such alien aid, on the other hand the Turks were rapidly losing all real independence, and were throwing away the last remnants of their once proud position in the world. The Turks, as an independent nation, were between the Devil of German Imperialism and the Deep Sea of the Entente Annexationists—an annexationism the justice of which few could be found to dispute—and no European is likely to feel much sympathy with them in that humiliating predicament.

At the beginning of the year the Ottoman Empire was beset by enemies on three sides. A large Russian Army, under the famous Grand-Duke Nicholas, was in occupation of Erzerum

and all Turkish Armenia. In far-off Mesopotamia a large Anglo-Indian force, under the command of that brilliant general, Sir Stanley Maude, was silently preparing to avenge the defeat at Kut. And on the Turco-Egyptian frontier another British Army was being steadily reinforced with a view to the liberation of Palestine from the Ottoman tyranny.

The first moves of the year came from Sir Stanley Maude, and they came with that swiftness which has been the mark of every great general in history. On the left bank of the Tigris the Turks still held very strong positions at Sanna-i-Yat, 15 miles below Kut. These positions had resisted all the attempts of the British to take them by storm during the long siege of Kut in 1916. On the right bank, however, the Turkish positions did not possess the same natural strength, and Sir Stanley Maude gradually forced his way up stream, on this side of the river, during the first six weeks of the year. The Turks held fortified lines in the Dahra Bend, above Kut. On February 15 Maude attacked these lines and carried them by assault. The land in this loop of the river was cleared of Turks, and 2,000 prisoners were taken. Two days later the lines at Sanna-i-Yat were again attacked, but with no success. The position was flanked on one side by marshes and on the other by the river, and hence arose its strength. However, it was not essential to General Maude's plan to take these lines by frontal attack. He probably did hope that the lines would give way, but the main object of the assault at this point was to distract the attention of the Turks from what was being planned higher up stream. On February 22 the Sanna-i-Yat lines were again attacked, and this time a foothold was gained in the foremost trenches. But before daybreak on the 23rd a blow was delivered at a different spot. Detachments were ferried across the river at Shumran, and in nine hours a bridge was built and a strong British force poured across to the left bank. The Turks' position was now turned, and they promptly abandoned Kut, and fled from Sanna-i-Yat. Over 1,700 prisoners and four guns were captured. The Turks retreated very rapidly, and being pursued by Anglo-Indian cavalry, their retirement soon became a rout. The British entered Kut on the 24th, and four days later the Turkish rearguards passed through Azizie, a village 50 miles above Kut-el Amara. From the 25th to the 28th 2,600 prisoners and twenty-four guns were captured. After this, although the retreat continued, it was somewhat less precipitate. The Ottoman Army did not halt at Ctesiphon, where the Turks had fought a successful action against General Townshend in 1915, but passed on as far as the river Diala, which flows into the Tigris 8 miles below Bagdad. The Anglo-Indian horse came into touch with this line on March 7. On the 8th bridges were thrown across the Tigris in this locality in order to facilitate the advance, and on the 9th the passage of the Diala was forced by means of a night attack. Pressing

forward with great energy, Sir Stanley Maude advanced on both sides of the Tigris, and early in the morning of March 11 the vanguard of the British Army entered Bagdad in triumph.

The subsequent operations, though less sensational, were hardly less successful. The advance was continued far beyond Bagdad. Sir Stanley Maude's front was flung out from Kizil Robat to Feluja on the Euphrates. Early in April the Anglo-Indian force established contact with the Russians at Kizil Robat, and by this junction a formidable barrier was opposed to any possible Turkish project for the reconquest of Bagdad.

After the British force had entered Bagdad, Sir Stanley Maude issued a proclamation to the inhabitants informing them that he did not come as a conqueror and oppressor of the people, but as a liberator, whose object was to free the Arabs from the Turkish yoke.

On April 22 an action was fought at Istabulat, the Turks being again severely defeated, and thereafter Sir Stanley Maude occupied the town and railway station of Samarra. After the Russian Revolution, the British did not long enjoy the co-operation of the Russian force, for it was announced in July that the Russian Mesopotamian Army, under the command of General Baratoff, had been withdrawn beyond the Russian frontier. On September 28, however, Maude won another victory at Ramadie, on the Euphrates, taking about 4,000 prisoners and a number of guns.

This was, unfortunately, the last of this brilliant general's victories. In November he contracted typhoid fever, and died after an illness of a few days. Sir Stanley Maude was beyond all doubt one of the ablest generals, possibly the ablest, whom the British Army had produced during the great war, and his name will always be linked with that of Bagdad (for Sir S. Maude's biography, see *Obituary*, p. 201). He was succeeded in the command of the Mesopotamian Expeditionary Force by General Sir William Marshall. No further important incidents occurred in this region up to the end of the year¹.

At the beginning of February the Grand Vizier, Said Halim, resigned, and he was succeeded by Talaat Bey, a personage notorious for his connection with the Armenian massacres. The more important members of Talaat Bey's new Cabinet were Messimy Bey (Foreign Minister), Moussu Kiazim Effendi (the Sheikh-ul-Islam), Enver Pasha (War Minister), Jemel Pasha (Minister of Marine), and Halil Bey (Minister of Justice). Talaat Bey made a declaration of policy to Parliament, saying that so long as one Ottoman soldier remained alive, Constantinople would not be surrendered.

After the American declaration of war against Germany the Ottoman Government notified Mr Elkus, the United States Ambassador at Constantinople, that diplomatic relations between

¹ For a description of the operations in Sinai and Palestine, see *Egypt*

the two countries must be regarded as severed. This was not followed, however, by a declaration of war.

In the course of a statement to Parliament at the beginning of October, Djavid Bey, Minister of Finance, said that the public debt of the Empire had now reached the sum of 297,000,000*l.* and about 18,000,000*l.* would be required to pay the interest. Yet the revenue of the Empire from existing taxes was computed at only 20,000,000*l.*

V RUMANIA.

The position of Rumania at the opening of the year was unhappy. No country had entered the war with higher hopes than did Rumania when she intervened in August, 1916, and no country had been so quickly disillusioned. Bukarest and all the country up to the line of the Sereth, including the whole of the Dobrudja, fell into the hands of the Central Powers before the end of 1916. The invaders made no further advance during 1917, however, and, indeed, they did not make any very serious attempt to do so. Thus the Rumanian forces maintained their hold upon the Moldavian province, and King Ferdinand's Government was established at Jassy.

Early in the year, soon after the Russian Revolution, General Iliescu, one of the leading generals of the Rumanian Army, caused to be published in the French Press an explanation, valid or invalid, of the great Rumanian disaster of the previous autumn. The general laid the whole blame upon the Russian Government, stating that they had failed to support the right wing of the Rumanian Army, having refrained from ordering an advance from Dorna Vatra into Hungary. He further accused the Tsar's Government of aiming deliberately at bringing about the defeat of Rumania in order to have a good excuse for concluding a separate peace with the Central Powers. This story gained wide currency—wider currency than credence. This and other accusations of deliberate treachery were made against the old Russian Government after the Tsar's fall. Some of the stories may well be true, but no adequate proofs were produced up to the end of 1917. This particular accusation was contradicted by the reports, both Russian and Rumanian, published at the time of the Transylvanian operations. The Russians did attack at Dorna Vatra, and attacked in great force, but the Austrians beat them off. It is true that the Russians did not emerge into Hungary, but not because they did not endeavour to do so.

At the end of 1916 the Rumanian Ministry, which had previously consisted of Liberals only, was reconstructed with the inclusion of members of the Conservative groups. M. Bratiano remained Prime Minister, and his Cabinet now included M. Vintila (War), M. Constantinesco (Home Office), M. Dvea (Education), M. Antonesco (Finance), M. Take Jonescu (without portfolio), and other statesmen. The most notable addition

was M. Take Jonescu, leader of the Conservative Democrats who had been throughout the war an enthusiastic admirer of the Entente

The possession of Wallachia was of considerable profit to the Central Powers. It was reported that the total harvest in the occupied part of Rumania amounted to 1,200,000 tons, and that half of this was apportioned to the Dual Monarchy, the remainder being left to the native population

During the year there was much talk in Jassy of political and economic reforms, but seeing that half the country was under hostile administration, and that affairs in the other half were much disturbed by the war, the proposed reforms had little more than an academic interest. It was proposed that the complicated electoral system hitherto in force should be abolished, and that equal direct universal suffrage, with secret ballots and proportional representation, should be established. It was also suggested that nearly 1,000,000 acres of cultivable land should be bestowed upon the peasants. The rustics of Rumania had hitherto lived under conditions little better than serfdom. It was also proposed to ameliorate the condition of the Jews, whose lot in the past had not been much superior to that of their co-religionists in the Russian Empire. These various proposals, with some modifications, received the academic approval of both Houses of the Jassy Legislature. At the end of July M. Bratiano reconstituted his Cabinet with M. Titulusco as Finance Minister, and M. Jonescu as a Minister without portfolio, but holding the position of Vice-President of the Cabinet

At the end of the year the Rumanian Government joined in the armistice which was concluded between Russia and the Central Powers. The country being completely isolated from all the remainder of the Allies, no other course of action was feasible.

VI GREECE

The year 1917 was very eventful in Greece. At the beginning of the year the situation in the country was most anomalous. It will be remembered that when the Austro-German and Bulgarian forces threatened Serbia in October, 1915, a Franco-British Army had been landed at Salonika, with the acquiescence of M. Venizelos, who was then Prime Minister, the object being, of course, to endeavour to save Serbia from being crushed by the enemy. Greece had a treaty of alliance with Serbia and the Entente Governments. M. Venizelos and his Cabinet, and the majority of the Greek Parliament as then constituted, held that the terms of this treaty bound Greece to go to the assistance of Serbia in the circumstances which arose at this time, that is, October, 1915. King Constantine, however, had taken a different view, and had consequently dismissed Venizelos and had steadily refused to be drawn into the war. The Franco-British force had entirely failed to render any effec-

tive aid to Serbia, but the Allied Governments had been determined not to abandon Salonika, and, indeed, so far from withdrawing the force from Greece, it had been further strengthened during 1916. Very little fighting had taken place, but the beginning of 1917 found the Allied Expedition still in Salomika, and with its advanced posts pushed up country as far as Monastir, the recapture of which from the Bulgarians had been the one considerable success attained in 1916.

The presence of the Franco-British Army in Greece was not, however, the only anomaly. In 1916 M. Venizelos, who had a very powerful following in the country, had repudiated the authority of King Constantine. Not only this, but he had himself appointed a "Government" with headquarters in Salonika. Thus Salonika and the eastern part of the Greek mainland (except the Kavalla district which had been conquered by the Bulgarians), together with Crete and most of the islands, was under a distinct Administration from that of Athens and the western provinces. And between the territories of the two Governments there existed a neutral zone, several miles wide, guarded by Entente troops.

At the beginning of January communications were exchanged between the Entente Governments and the Athens Ministry in reference to an attack which had been made on Allied Marines by Greek troops in Athens on December 1, 1916. The Allied Governments demanded the removal of Greek Royalist troops from the Peloponnese, the formal saluting of the flags of Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy in Athens, and other reparations. The Greek Government accepted these demands, and on January 29 the flags were formally saluted with every publicity, as required.

At the end of April the Prime Minister, Professor Lambros, resigned, and a Cabinet was formed by M. Zaimis, a conscientious statesman who had been Premier several times before and had endeavoured to steer a middle course between the Venizelists and the actively Germanophil faction.

The position, however, was such that even M. Zaimis could not bring about a reconciliation between the Royalists and the Entente. The so-called "Government of National Defence" at Salonika became increasingly hostile to King Constantine, and at the end of May M. Venizelos openly declared that the King was still in daily secret communication with Germany and that reconciliation was impossible. Shortly after this the French and British Governments decided to adopt drastic measures. It was decided that King Constantine could no longer be tolerated on the throne. Accordingly, on June 11, the French Government, through their special commissioner in Greece, M. Jonnart, demanded the abdication of the King and the designation of his successor. On the same day French troops were landed at Corinth. The King, who had no doubt been expecting this demand, complied without resistance, and

he abdicated in favour of his second son, Alexander. On the following day the King, the Queen, and the Crown Prince left Greece on a French steamer, and proceeded to Switzerland, and thence to Germany.

The French and British Governments approved of the proposal to bestow the crown upon Prince Alexander. The new sovereign was 23 years of age and unmarried. Acting under the instructions of M. Jonnart he called upon M. Venizelos to form a Cabinet, and thus the reunion of the two halves of Greece was accomplished. The new Cabinet included M. Politis (Foreign Minister), M. Repoulis (Interior), and M. Negropontes (Finance). The new Government immediately severed diplomatic relations with the Central Powers, and steps were taken to convoke the Parliament of 1915, which had been dissolved by King Constantine when he decided to veto the pro-Entente policy of M. Venizelos. Proceedings were also taken against the leaders of the Germanophil faction, including even Professor Lambros and other Cabinet Ministers. M. Jonnart nominally acted throughout as the Commissioner of the "Protecting Powers"—France, Great Britain, and Russia—but the Russian Government took no active part in the matter, and, indeed, dissociated themselves to some extent from the policy of intervention in Hellenic affairs.

VII. SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO.

The whole of Montenegro and all Serbia except Monastir and its environs were occupied by the troops of the Central Alliance throughout the year. The sufferings of the people, especially in Serbia, had been exceedingly severe throughout the war. According to the great German Socialist paper *Vorwärts*, over 1,000,000 Serbians—25 per cent of the population—had perished from privation and famine. The *de lege* Government of Serbia was established in Corfu, and M. Pashitch remained Prime Minister. During June and July conferences were held in Corfu between the Serbian Government and representatives of the extreme revolutionary party of the Jugo-Slav provinces of Austria-Hungary. An agreement was reached on the question of Pan-Serbian ambitions. It was agreed that the Jugo-Slav provinces of the Dual Monarchy ought to be united with Serbia and Montenegro into a single state under the Karageorgevitch dynasty. This pact, known as the "Corfu Agreement," was signed by M. Pashitch and M. A. Trumbitch, leader of the Jugo-Slav Separatists. The Montenegrin Government took no part in these negotiations, and was understood to be hostile to the whole scheme, an attitude which was not unnatural, seeing that the proposals involved the abolition of the dynasty and independence of the little kingdom.

VIII. BULGARIA.

Little reliable news was received concerning internal affairs in this country during the year. M. Radoslavoff's Government remained in power, and its chief administrative work consisted in the ruthless bulgarisation of that part of Macedonia which Bulgaria had always claimed, and which was occupied by King Ferdinand's savage troops throughout the year. It was true that part of the population in this territory had always been Bulgarian in character and sentiment, but another section had welcomed the union with Serbia, and rumours were current that the Bulgarians were treating the Serbophil element with terrible barbarity. In the autumn, the Bulgarian Government published a *résumé* of the aims which it was hoped Bulgaria would achieve in the peace-settlement, these aims including the annexation of a large part of Macedonia and of the Dobrudja.

IX. ALBANIA.

This country, which had been nominally neutral in the war, was the scene of military operations during the year, although here, as on the remainder of the Balkan front, the fighting was not severe. Austro-Hungarian troops occupied the northern part of the country, about two-thirds of the whole area, and an Italian force, based upon the Valona, held the southern district. The Italian Government made known its intentions in regard to the principality in a proclamation issued at Argyrocastro on June 3. It was declared that the unity and autonomy of all Albania would be established under the *egis* and protection of Italy. Albania was promised free political institutions, law-courts, schools, and an army of her own. In internal affairs the Albanians were to have full liberty, but the foreign relations of the state were to be supervised by Italy. This proclamation was issued by Italy separately, not by the Entente Powers as a whole.

CHAPTER IV.

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE: BELGIUM
—LUXEMBURG—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN
—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—SWEDEN—NORWAY.

I. BELGIUM.

THROUGHOUT the year the whole of Belgium, save only the small district around Ypres which had never been lost, continued to be occupied by German troops. The history of Belgium during this year is therefore once more twofold: it is the history of the *de lege* Government, which enjoyed at Le Havre the friendly hospitality of the French Republic, and it also recounts the doings of the usurping and tyrannous German Administration at Brussels. On January 10 the Belgian Gov-

ernment sent a special communication to the United States President, anent his note to the belligerents calling upon them to state their peace terms. This communication stated that the Royal Government appreciated Dr. Wilson's motives, but that he was labouring under an illusion in supposing that the two hostile camps were pursuing the same war aims. The case of Belgium proved that Germany cared nothing for the rights of weak peoples. Before the war Belgium had discharged all the obligations of neutrality towards all her neighbours. Her territory had been arbitrarily invaded. Cruel exactions had been placed upon the little nation, and thousands of Belgian workmen had been carried off into slavery. The Royal Government expressed its gratitude to the Americans associated with the "Commission for Relief in Belgium". The Royal Government hoped that in the final settlement of the war the claims of the Entente Powers regarding Belgium would find a unanimous echo in the United States.

In the spring the London *Times* published an account of the existing conditions of life in occupied Belgium by Mr J. P. Whitaker, an Englishman who had recently escaped from the country. It appeared that the invaders made a distinction between the inhabitants of the occupied districts of France and the people of Belgium. The latter were systematically treated less badly than the former. The writer stated that there was no serious privation in Belgium, and that in Brussels the supply of food was about equal to that of peace-time. He stated that the streets of the Belgian capital gave a prosperous and even gay appearance. Mr. Whitaker constantly referred to the contrast existing between Belgium and the invaded portion of France. "The German gentleness towards the Belgians is only equalled by their bitterness towards the French". So far as the writer saw, the only part of Belgium which was suffering privation was the district along the French frontier, where the conditions approximated to those prevailing in Lille.

The German authorities divided the country for administrative purposes into a Flemish province, with Brussels as capital, and a Walloon province, with Namur as capital.

The ugliest feature of the German tyranny was the deportation of thousands of civilians to Germany, on the ground that they were unemployed. These deportations took place chiefly in the earlier months of the year. The Netherlands Government secured some mitigation of the conditions under which these measures were executed.

II. LUXEMBURG.

Very little news of this little monarchy was received in England during the year. The country's position in respect of the war remained the same: the territory continued to be occupied by the Imperial troops, and for all practical purposes the country was under the rule of Berlin, but the Grand-

Duchess's Government nevertheless remained legally neutral. Neither group of belligerents made any definite declarations in regard to the destiny of the duchy in the post-war settlement. On the side of the Central Powers, however, it may almost be taken for granted that their wishes, in the event of their being victorious, or even obtaining a drawn war, would be to restore the duchy to the position of a German federal state which it had held up to 1866. On the side of the Entente Powers no specific statements were made, but it was evident that official circles in Paris contemplated severing the little country from its former economic union with Germany. This was implicit in the Franco-Russian treaty of February, 1917 (see *Russia*, page 257), which contemplated the erection of another neutral state lying between Luxemburg and Germany, and although it was extremely doubtful how far that treaty represented French policy at the end of the year, it is unlikely that the more modest project of entirely separating Luxemburg from Germany had been abandoned.

Whilst many of the common folk were very hostile to the usurping Imperial authorities, the Grand-Duchess herself appears to have maintained amicable relations with the German royalties, and in June she paid an official visit to the Bavarian Court.

A change of Ministry took place in June, Herr Kauffmann becoming Prime Minister. The new Premier had previously held a place in the Cabinet as Finance Minister.

Strikes occurred in many parts of Luxemburg during the summer. The cause of these disturbances was for the most part economic, not political. The workers demanded higher pay, by way of compensation for war-conditions.

III. THE NETHERLANDS.

Holland, like all the other neutral countries situated in the immediate vicinity of the theatres of the war, suffered very considerable inconvenience from the continuance of hostilities. A large part of the Army had been mobilised since 1914. In order to meet the large additional national expenditure which was thus being perpetually incurred, the Government issued at the beginning of the year a 4 per cent state loan for 10,500,000*l*. The amount was over-subscribed, applications being made for bonds to the total value of 11,000,000*l*.

On January 24 and 25 debates took place in the Lower House on various questions of foreign policy. The subject of the German deportations of Belgians was discussed, the Dutch Government having previously intervened in the hope of inducing the German authorities to mitigate or even reverse their policy. Much diversity of opinion was shown, some speakers condemning the doings of the Germans in violent terms, and others expressing the opinion that it was not the duty of the Netherlands to meddle in what was a question of the inter-

nal policy of Germany. Jonkheer F. Loudon, the Foreign Minister, rebuked the anti-German members for using impolite language about a friendly Government, but said that the Dutch Cabinet were urging the German Government to put into practice their promise to permit deported Belgians to return to their homes. Jonkheer Loudon also made a statement on the Ministry's attitude towards the possibility of peace negotiations. The Government had refused to fall in with President Wilson's peace move in December, and, although the suggestion of the King of Sweden that a conference of neutral states should be held was being examined by the Dutch Minister in Stockholm, the Government did not regard the moment as opportune for any kind of intervention.

After the German Government announced their new submarine campaign on January 31, the Dutch Government again refused to be influenced by Dr. Wilson. They refused to adopt the American suggestion that all neutrals should sever diplomatic relations with Germany. Speaking in the Lower House on February 8, the Prime Minister, Dr. Cort van der Linden, announced that the Government had sent a note to Berlin protesting against the new submarine measures as being contrary to International Law, but, said the Premier, there was no more reason for Holland to change her foreign policy now than on the many other occasions when International Law had been violated.

On February 22 seven large Dutch liners which left Falmouth on that day were attacked by a German submarine, and three of them were sunk, though no lives were lost. This appears to have been due to a misunderstanding. The Dutch Government had asked the German Government to permit these vessels to pass through the war-zone in security, and a discussion took place on the question of the date of sailing. The German Government guaranteed "absolute" security on March 17, and "relative" security on February 22, the reason for the latter qualification being that it might not be possible to communicate with all the submarine commanders by the earlier date. Nevertheless, the Dutch shipowners ordered their vessels to sail in a group on February 22, and the ships were unfortunately attacked by a submarine commander who had heard nothing of the "guarantee." The German Government expressed regret, gave over to Holland vessels of equal value then lying in the ports of the Dutch East Indies, and paid compensation to the crews of the sunken liners.

The Dutch suffered somewhat severely from the prevailing shortage of food supplies. Food riots took place in Amsterdam in July, and on several occasions the disturbances became so serious that it became necessary to call out the military.

Several minor disputes arose between Great Britain and Holland during the year. In the autumn the British Government felt obliged to protest against the facilities which the

Dutch were giving Germany to transport sand and gravel across Holland into Belgium, these materials being used, according to the British account, for the construction of defensive works along the German front.

The Dutch Government also maintained a special rule of neutrality forbidding armed merchantmen to enter Dutch ports, and this called forth protests from the British Government, and a lengthy discussion ensued.

IV. SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Government were successful in maintaining the neutrality of the republic throughout the year. In regard to the war, the sympathies of the people continued to be divided, the division following the linguistic line of separation with extraordinary accuracy. The German Swiss, who constituted, of course, the majority of the nation, were favourable to the Central Powers, whilst the sympathies of the people of the French and Italian Cantons were equally warmly on the side of the Entente.

In the controversy which arose at the time of the initiation of the new German submarine campaign in February, Herr Schulthess's Ministry adopted the same policy as did the Governments of Scandinavia and the Netherlands. A formal protest was sent to Berlin condemning the new measures as being contrary to International Law, but, in spite of the exhortations of the United States President, no further diplomatic action was taken, and there was no serious thought of severing relations with Germany. The note to Berlin declared that Switzerland had already suffered seriously in an economic sense from the war, and that these privations would now be aggravated, even though the French port of *Cette* was to be specifically excepted from the German blockade measures.

A large part of the Army was maintained on a war footing throughout the year, and it is notable that the total cost of mobilisation for the first three years of the war was 25,000,000 $\text{l}.$, a considerable expenditure for a small nation to bear. In June considerable excitement was caused in Europe, and particularly in Entente countries, by the revelation of the fact that the Swiss Foreign Minister, Herr Hoffmann, had acted as an intermediary for the conveyance of an Austro-German peace offer to the Russian Government. Herr Hoffmann sent a certain message to the Swiss Minister in Petrograd, Herr Odier, by means of the Swiss official cypher, this message containing an outline of the German peace terms. Herr Odier was instructed to inform Herr Robert Grimm, a well-known Swiss Socialist Member of Parliament then in the Russian capital, of the contents of the telegram, and it was expected that Herr Grimm would bring the matter to the knowledge of the Russian Government, or the Socialist members thereof. The German proposal thus conveyed to Petrograd was that Germany would promise to make

no assault upon the Russian troops so long as they, on their side did not attack, and that Germany was desirous of concluding an honourable peace with Russia, with the re-establishment of commercial intercourse, financial help for Russia, a friendly arrangement respecting Poland, Lithuania, and Courland, and mutual restoration of Russian and Austrian territories. On being acquainted with these proposals, the Russian Government promptly expelled Herr Grimm from Russia. An explanatory note was issued by Herr Hoffmann, in which he stated that his message had been sent to Petrograd in answer to a request for information which Herr Grimm had made. Herr Hoffmann said that he had taken this action in the interests of peace, which was needed by all Europe, including his own country. Nevertheless, on June 19, the Foreign Minister resigned his place in the Cabinet. Herr Schulthess issued a statement declaring that Herr Hoffmann had acted without the knowledge of any other member of the Cabinet, and that if the Cabinet had known of his intentions they would have disapproved. Herr Grimm was similarly disavowed by the Socialist Party in Parliament. In succession to Herr Hoffmann, the Federal Parliament elected Herr G. Ador to the Ministry. Herr Hoffmann was President of the Confederation in 1914.

A general election was held on October 28, the result being that the Radicals maintained their majority, although the strength of the Socialist party was increased.

On December 13, Dr. Felix Calonder was duly elected President of the Swiss Republic, and Dr. Edward Muller was elected Vice-President.

It was reported in December that a proposal was before Parliament to increase the legal number of Cabinet Ministers from seven to nine.

The Swiss suffered severely from the prevailing scarcity of food supplies, and a rigid system of compulsory rationing was in force.

V. SPAIN.

The entry of the United States into the war left Spain in the position of being by far the most important neutral country in the world. Of the neutral population of Europe, the Spanish nation constituted almost exactly one half. Moreover, the Spaniards enjoyed the fruits of neutrality in a manner which was impossible for the other neutral states of Europe, situated as they were much nearer the main scene of the conflict. Owing to the geographical situation of the country, the people were under no temptation to try to trade with the Central Powers, and hence Spanish import trade was subject to none of those wearisome restrictions, which the French and British Governments found it necessary to impose upon all the Teutonic neutrals. In Spain, therefore, conditions of life were almost normal, and white bread was good, plentiful, and cheap.

The country was not free from political difficulties, but these had no connection with the issues involved in the great war. On January 9 the Liberal Prime Minister, Count Romanones, tendered to the King the resignation of the whole Cabinet, owing to the opposition to the Government's financial measures which had been shown in Parliament. The King took counsel with most of the leading statesmen, and in the evening of the same day he asked Count Romanones to resume office. The Count therefore consented to continue to carry on the Government, and he remained in power for several months longer.

At the beginning of February, Spain, like other countries, was called upon to face the awkward situation caused by the German announcement of unrestricted submarine warfare. The Spanish Government sent a protest to Berlin, stating that in their opinion the new measures were quite inadmissible in International Law. Spain also received immediately the American President's invitation to all neutrals to follow the example of the United States and sever diplomatic relations with Germany, but to this invitation the Spanish Government sent a reply refusing to follow this course. In certain circles, particularly of course amongst shipowners, dissatisfaction with the Government's mild policy was expressed, and Senor Lerroux, leader of the Republican Party, made a speech in the Lower House condemning the whole policy of neutrality, which he said had become derogatory to Spain's dignity.

The agitation against neutrality continued among certain democratic factions, and the occasional sinking of Spanish ships, notably the *San Fulgencio* at the beginning of April, caused considerable anger; but the nation as a whole, particularly the upper classes, remained averse from any thought of intervention. In April Count Romanones again resigned, chiefly owing to difficulties connected with internal politics, but partly also owing to the international situation. The Count felt that the German Government were making a policy of continued neutrality almost impossible, and, at the best, very humiliating to Spain; but he was aware that neither the Parliament nor the country would support a war policy. This time King Alfonso accepted the Premier's resignation. A new Cabinet, with the Marquis Alhucemas as Prime Minister, was then formed, and this was constituted as follows:—

Prime Minister—Marquis Alhucemas (Senor Garcia Prieto).

Foreign Minister—Senor Juan Alvarado.

Finance Minister—Senor Santiago Alba.

Minister of the Interior—Senor Julio Burell

Minister of War—General Aguilera.

Minister of Marine—Admiral Miranda.

Minister of Justice—Senor Ruiz Valarino.

Minister of Public Works—Duke of Almodovar del Valle.

Minister of Education—Senor José Franco Rodriguez

This Ministry did not survive long. All the more energetic

elements in Spanish life, particularly the reforming politicians of Catalonia, had long complained of the inefficiency of the administration of public affairs. The Spanish Civil Service had been for many years notoriously incompetent, and in many cases corrupt also. Much discontent existed in the Army, the junior officers being very badly paid. At the end of May the general unrest made itself felt through the Army, and the Government were thereby placed in a very awkward position. The officers of the infantry, in nearly all the garrison towns in the country, formed so-called "Committees of Defence" with a view to remedying their grievances. The lead was taken by the officers of the Barcelona garrison. The Government became aware of the existence of these Committees of Defence, and they seem to have considered that the agitation was seditious in intention. General Alfau, commanding the Barcelona district, was instructed to order the dissolution of the committees in his command. The officers refused to obey, and General Alfau thereupon put them under arrest. Hearing this news, the officers of the committees in other garrisons, including Valencia and Saragossa, revolted and demanded to be arrested, since they were determined to stand by their colleagues. The Government were seized with panic; they recalled General Alfau to Madrid, and sent General Marina to Barcelona in his place. General Marina liberated the officers forthwith, but on June 9 the Premier felt it necessary to tender his resignation to King Alfonso. The King sent for Señor Dato, the Conservative leader, who had been Premier before Count Romanones, and who had always been associated with schemes for Army reform. Señor Dato was able to form a Cabinet which included the following politicians.—

Prime Minister—Señor Dato
Foreign Minister—Marquess Lem.
Finance Minister—Señor Bugallal.
Minister of the Interior—Señor S. Guerra.
Minister of War—General Primo de Rivera.
Minister of Marine—General Flores.
Minister of Justice—Señor Burgos.
Minister of Public Works—Viscount Eza.
Minister of Education—Señor Andrade

Señor Dato was a strong man, and he had the support of most Conservatives and of the more moderate Liberals, but the stability of the Executive, and even, it was alleged, of the Monarchy, was severely tested during the next few months.

The officers' "Committee of Defence" issued a statement setting forth their grievances. The committee claimed that the Army was neglected, that the officers were grossly underpaid, and that promotion was usually to be obtained by favouritism. The committee demanded official recognition by the authorities, but disclaimed any seditious intentions, and expressed their firm determination, provided they received such recognition, to maintain discipline.

The unrest was not confined to the Army, but extended to the working classes of many districts, including the coal-miners. At the end of June Senor Dato advised the King to suspend the "Constitutional Guarantees," a measure which was almost equivalent to a declaration of martial law. The firmness shown by the new Premier, coupled as it was with the acceptance of much-needed military reforms, had a tranquillising effect upon the country, and all the more moderate elements in the nation rallied to Senor Dato. The Government and the King himself were, however, violently attacked by the extremists on both the Right and the Left. A group of extreme Conservatives, followers of Senor Maura, refused to give support to the new Conservative Government, and began to associate with the avowed Carlists. One day in June King Alfonso's portrait at the Maurist Club in Madrid was defaced by one of these malcontents. Amongst politicians of the Left there was also considerable activity. The Socialists, Republicans, and Reformists (Radicals) combined forces and issued joint manifestos. They condemned the policy of neutrality, and declared that Spain ought to join the Entente Powers, or, at the least, ought to sever diplomatic relations with Germany. And they declared that the country's ills could not be remedied under the present regime.

The unrest spread, as already stated, from the Army to the general population. The civil servants and the police followed the example of the military officers in forming Committees of Defence. A semi-revolutionary movement broke out in Barcelona, among the Catalonian Regionalists. At a meeting held in that city on July 5, about twenty Senators and about forty Deputies demanded the immediate assembling of Parliament, with the powers of a Constituent Assembly, in order to consider the Catalonian demand for Home Rule, and, indeed, the whole proposal for reorganising the Government of Spain on the system of general devolution. The resolution which was passed at this meeting also threatened that if this request were refused by the Government, the Catalonian members would call a meeting of Parliament in Barcelona on July 19 on their own responsibility.

The demand was refused by the Premier, and the proposed meeting in Barcelona was, necessarily, prohibited. Nevertheless, about seventy Deputies and Senators proceeded to the Catalonian capital, and on the appointed day they did succeed in assembling, by adopting the device of gathering in a different building from that originally advertised as the place of meeting. The assembly was, however, subsequently broken up by the Governor of Barcelona. A resolution was passed protesting against the Ministry's refusal to convoke the legislature.

In August strikes took place in many parts of Spain, and on the 13th the Government declared martial law and called up certain classes of reservists. Disturbances and collisions between the troops and the strikers occurred in many places. In Madrid there was little necessity for repressive measures, but

in Barcelona there was bloodshed in the streets. The troops appear to have been thoroughly loyal everywhere, and the strikers were overawed. After a few days most of the strikes collapsed, and on August 20 the Government demobilised the reservists. The strikes were organised by the Republicans and Socialists, and were confessedly revolutionary in character; it was intended that the strike should be general, but the revolutionaries discovered that they had less support than they had anticipated, and, in particular, they were disowned by the Catalan Regionalists. In Asturias the strikes lasted three weeks. On October 18 a decree was issued terminating the suspension of Constitutional Guarantees.

On October 27 Senor Dato resigned, chiefly owing to his failure to come to an agreement with the Military "Committees of Defence." After some discussion, the King then sent for the Marquis Alhucemas (Senor Don Garcia Prieto), and that statesman once more succeeded in forming a Cabinet. The new Ministry was a coalition, and included the following members:—

Prime Minister and Foreign Minister—Marquis Alhucemas.
Minister of the Interior—Senor Bahamonde.
Finance Minister—Senor Ventosa.
War Minister—Senor La Cierva.
Minister of Marine—Senor Gimeno.
Education Minister—Senor Rodes.
Minister of Public Works—Senor Zamora.
Minister of Justice—Senor Don Fernandez Prida.

Of the new Ministers the Premier and Senor Zamora were Liberals and Senor La Cierva and Senor Don F. Prida were Conservatives. Senor Ventosa and Senor Rodes were Catalan Regionalists, and their presence in the Cabinet therefore represented an innovation.

In December it was decided to dissolve Parliament, and at the end of the year active election campaigns were being carried on all over the country by the different political parties. The Regionalists were particularly energetic, and were advocating a policy of general devolution.

VI. PORTUGAL.

The year was somewhat eventful in this restless little republic. In the spring Dr. Antonio d'Almeida's Cabinet issued a decree establishing a National Economic Council, a body whose proposed function, as the name implies, was to deal with the commercial affairs of the nation. The Chamber of Deputies took the view that this decree was derogatory to the dignity of Parliament, and a motion was passed by 57 votes to 21 cancelling the Government's decree, and hence on April 20 the Cabinet resigned. The President, Dr. Machado, entrusted Dr. Affonso Costa with the task of forming a Cabinet. The Democratic Party rallied to the support of Dr. Costa, and his new Ministry included Senor A. Soares (Foreign Affairs), Senor A. Ribeiro (Interior), and Captain Norton Mattos (War). The

Premier himself took the portfolio of Finance. In October President Machado paid a visit to England and France.

Early in September serious riots and demonstrations against the Government took place in Lisbon. The disorders were suppressed, but at the beginning of December there was another rising, and after sanguinary fighting in Lisbon the Government and the President were driven from office. The revolutionary faction appointed Senor Bracamps as Provisional President,¹ and a Cabinet was formed by the revolutionary leader, Major Paes. The personnel of the new Ministry was as follows:—

Premier, War Minister, and Foreign Minister—Major S. Paes.
Minister of the Interior—Captain M. Santos.
Minister of Education—Senor A. Magalhaes
Minister of Justice—Senor M. Pinto.
Minister of Labour—Captain F. Costa
Minister of Marine—Senor A. Branco.
Minister of Commerce—Senor X. Estenes.
Minister of Finance—Senor S. Viegas
Minister for the Colonies—Senor T. Balboza.

At the end of 1916 the first Portuguese troops destined for the Western Front arrived in Paris, and during 1917 the Portuguese contingents were gradually moved into the theatre of operations. Very few details respecting the Portuguese forces were published. The expeditionary force in France was under the command of General Fernando Tamagnini.

VII. DENMARK

The Danish Government maintained a position of impartial neutrality throughout the year, and were able to keep the country remarkably free from diplomatic complications. The first principle of Danish foreign policy was the promotion of the co-operation of the Scandinavian nations. Although the country was thus free from serious political troubles, the war had adverse economic effects upon the people. It will be remembered that the British Government, in their policy of blockading Germany, had found it necessary to restrict imports into the contiguous neutral states, and hence these neutral peoples, more particularly the Danes, suffered incidentally from the British blockade. No very serious privations arose from this cause up to the end of 1916, but during 1917 the agricultural interests of Denmark undoubtedly suffered somewhat severely. It must be remembered, however, that during the earlier part of the war many Danes made large profits, and some of them huge fortunes, from forwarding goods to Germany. This fact was not disputed, and, indeed, the sudden appearance of a whole class of *nouveau riche* persons in Copenhagen was a notorious subject of comment in that city. This profitable trade was now largely reduced. The stoppage of the importation of

¹ Major Paes was subsequently made Provisional President.

feeding-stuffs for live stock caused the farmers heavy losses. Many cattle and multitudes of pigs had to be killed because no food for them could be obtained. The British maritime measures, though essential to an efficient blockade of Germany, aroused considerable resentment in Denmark. Compulsory rationing of sugar and bread was adopted, the weekly allowance of bread being approximately 4½ lbs

When the new German submarine campaign began in February, the Danish Government, acting in concert with Sweden and Norway, sent a protest to Berlin, but the Government refused to adopt the American President's advice to sever relations with Germany.

On April 1 the Danish West Indian Islands, which had been sold to the United States in the previous year for 5,000,000*l.*, were duly transferred. The King sent the islanders a farewell message, bidding them remember the centuries during which they had been united to Denmark and wishing them a happy future. The Islands were henceforth to be known as the Virgin Islands of the United States. By the same agreement the American Government recognised Danish sovereignty over the whole of Greenland.

Mr Stauning, the leader of the Socialist Party, and a member (without portfolio) of the Coalition Government, took an active part in the arrangements for the abortive Stockholm Peace Conference of Socialists; his action in doing so was severely criticised by the Conservatives, who ordered their representative in the Cabinet, Mr. C. M. Rottboll, to resign from the Ministry; but the King and the Radical Premier, Mr. Karl Zahle, do not seem to have disapproved of Mr. Stauning's activities, and they asked Mr Rottboll to remain in the Cabinet, which, to the chagrin of most of his own party, he consented to do.

In foreign affairs there was a tendency towards a *rapprochement* with Germany, and in the autumn it was announced that negotiations were taking place with a view to the purchase by Denmark of the town and district of Hadersleben. This was the most Danish district of Schleswig, and the proposal was that the Danish Government should use the 5,000,000*l.* obtained by the sale of the West Indian Islands, in order to purchase Hadersleben from Prussia.

In November King Gustav of Sweden paid an official visit to Copenhagen.

During the year demands for an increase of autonomous powers were made by the Icelandic Diet.

VIII. SWEDEN.

As the war progressed Sweden began to play a more important part in the international complications than any other neutral country in Europe, or, indeed, in the world. Her geographical position made it impossible for her to maintain

the aloof attitude which characterised Spain, and the Swedish Ministry did not show the extreme circumspection in dealing with, or refraining from dealing with, the reactions of the war which had been displayed from the very beginning of the conflict by the Government of the Netherlands. The Swedes were the only neutral nation who seriously made their voice heard in continental affairs, and although they were a small nation, they were also a very vigorous little nation, and they occupied a geographical position which gave them an importance which was out of proportion to their numbers. The Court, the upper classes, and the Conservative Party were notoriously inclined to favour the Central Powers. They were strongly anti-Russian, and somewhat pro-German. On the other hand, the lower classes and the Liberal and Socialist Parties, though not actually partisans of the Entente cause, were quite neutralist in sentiment, notwithstanding that up to the time of the Revolution they shared the prevalent antipathy to Russia. In internal affairs the two most important subjects occupying the attention of the people were the scarcity of food and the problem of electoral reform.

At the end of December, 1916, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Switzerland sent notes to the belligerent Powers seconding the advice given by President Wilson in his famous peace move of December 20. Holland did not associate herself with the other Teutonic neutrals in this action. The Central Powers promptly replied that they hoped to see a peace conference called immediately. The reply of the Entente Powers, which was given to the respective Ministers of the four small states in Paris on January 17, merely called attention to the Entente's reply to the American President, and declared that it was not possible to respond to the wishes which had been conveyed to them.

When the German Government announced the new submarine campaign at the end of January, the three Scandinavian Governments met this new difficulty with a common policy. A joint note was sent to Berlin protesting against the new measures as being contrary to International Law and as violating the time-honoured rights of neutrals. Sweden, however, refused to agree with Dr Wilson's suggestion that all neutrals should sever diplomatic relations with Germany, because, it was explained, the policy of the country was to maintain absolutely impartial neutrality between the two belligerent camps. Similar replies were sent to Dr. Wilson by the Danish and Norse Cabinets.

At the end of February a Cabinet crisis arose, which eventually caused the resignation of Mr. Hammarskjöld's Administration. The Government asked Parliament to vote 30 million crowns for the purpose of strengthening the defences of the country. This vote was passed by the Upper House, but the Lower House, wherein the Liberals and Socialists together

possessed a majority, reduced the amount to 10 million crowns. A joint session of the two Houses was held on March 3 and the Government's proposal was then again defeated by 187 votes to 172. Mr. Hammarskjold thereupon tendered the Cabinet's resignation to the King, but the Sovereign requested the Premier to remain in office and endeavour to find a solution of the difficulty. Within a few weeks, however, it became clear that the Cabinet could not survive the hostility of the diet, and the Prime Minister again resigned. This time King Gustav accepted the resignation, and called upon another of the Conservative leaders, Mr. Carl Swartz, to form a Government. The composition of the Cabinet was announced on March 30 and was as follows:—

Prime Minister—Mr. Carl Swartz.
Foreign Minister—Admiral Lindman
Finance Minister—Mr. Carleson.
Minister of Justice—Mr. S. Stenberg.
Minister of the Interior—Mr. von Sydow
Minister of War—Colonel Akerman.
Minister of the Navy—Commodore Ericson.
Minister of Education and for Ecclesiastical Affairs—Mr. Hammarstrom.
Minister of Agriculture—Mr. Dahlberg
Ministers without portfolio—Mr. Ericson and Mr. Falk

Throughout the war the closest co-operation had been maintained on all questions of foreign policy between the three Scandinavian Governments, and under the auspices of the new Swedish Ministry joint meetings of Scandinavian Ministers were held at Stockholm at the beginning of May. It was announced that this conference had agreed to maintain impartial neutrality in the war, and to abstain from taking the initiative in any mediation between the belligerents, either by themselves or in concert with other neutrals, and had approved the policy of collaborating with other neutral states in the defence of neutral rights.

At the end of April, King Christian of Denmark visited King Gustav at Stockholm.

The events of the summer did not tend to increase the Swedes' regard for either group of belligerents. The German submarine campaign caused much disgust in shipping circles, whilst on the other hand the American and British restrictions upon imports into Scandinavia were the source of much inconvenience and even suffering to the masses of the Swedish people, and there arose accordingly considerable resentment at these irksome measures.

Throughout the summer there was much discussion of a proposal to hold an International Peace Conference in Stockholm. The proposal was made in the first instance by a Dutch-Scandinavian Committee of Socialists, of which Mr. Branting, the leader of the Swedish Socialists, was Chairman, and it subsequently obtained the ardent support of the powerful Russian Socialist Party. The Governments of the Central Powers, although of course they were far from favourable to Socialism

as such, desired a peace by negotiation, and they therefore placed no obstacle in the way of holding the conference. On the other hand, the British, French, and Italian Governments refused to give passports to their respective Socialist Parties for this purpose, and it was therefore impossible to hold the conference. The various Socialist Parties of Europe took the opportunity, however, of sending statements on peace-terms to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee, and by his judicial and reasoned comments upon the issues involved Mr. Branting earned a high reputation in Progressive circles all over the Continent.

In September the American Government announced that their secret service had discovered that the Swedish Foreign Office had been permitting the transmission of German official cypher messages as its own official messages; and that these German messages included, in particular, messages from Count Luxburg, the German Chargé d'Affaires at Buenos Aires, relating to the sinking of steamers, among them Argentine vessels, by German submarines. The Swedish Government did not deny that German messages had been sent, but they declared that they were ignorant of the purport of the messages, and they sent a note to Berlin protesting that the German Foreign Office had "abused the confidence shown by Sweden." Swedish Liberals and Socialists held meetings at which the carelessness of the Stockholm Foreign Office was severely condemned.

During September a general election was held. The elections came opportunely in respect of the relations between Sweden and the Entente Powers, because the Conservative Party, which had been responsible for the constant friction with the Entente, was thoroughly defeated. The new House consisted of nearly a hundred Socialists, sixty Liberals, fifty-eight Conservatives and a few Independent Conservatives. A small section of extreme Socialists had split off from Mr. Branting's great party, and adopted an independent line of policy. The result was a decisive victory for a policy of neutrality less "benign" towards Germany, for the restriction of the export of the necessities of life to Central Europe and elsewhere, and for a policy of reforming the franchise in the direction of universal suffrage, including votes for women. The Conservative Ministry resigned, and after much negotiation Mr. Eden, the Liberal leader, formed a Coalition Cabinet of Liberals and Socialists. The personnel of the new Government was announced on October 19, and the Ministry as thus constituted included Mr. Hellner (Foreign Affairs), Mr. Branting (Finance), Mr. Nilsson (War), Mr. Schotte (Interior), and several other statesmen. The differences between parties in Sweden were very wide and very real, and the whole character and trend of Swedish official policy were fundamentally altered by these elections.

In November it was announced that the population of the Aland Islands had proclaimed their desire to be annexed to Sweden.

IX NORWAY

The Norwegian Government maintained neutrality throughout the year, in spite of the severe provocation which the German maritime war-measures gave from time to time. In external affairs the Norse authorities acted in close partnership with the other Scandinavian states. When the unrestricted German submarine campaign was commenced in February, the Government sent a protest to Berlin, acting jointly with Sweden and Denmark, but the Ministry did not think it necessary or desirable to sever diplomatic relations with Germany on this ground. Nevertheless, the Norwegians suffered most grievous loss at sea from the ruthless German methods of warfare; and, indeed, the Norse mercantile marine was more seriously affected than that of any other neutral nation. In one week in April, thirteen ships, representing over 23,000 tons, were sunk by submarines, and from the beginning of the war up to the middle of April about 450 ships, of 640,000 tons, had been lost through submarines and mines. Nor was this all, for 350 persons had lost their lives during the destruction of the vessels. These losses naturally caused intense resentment in the country, and Norway was alone among the Teutonic neutrals in being almost entirely anti-German in sentiment.

In June much excitement was caused by the discovery of a great German spy-plot. A certain Baron von Rautenfels, an official German courier, was arrested in a hotel in Christiania, whilst in possession of a trunk containing fifty-five deadly bombs. It was discovered that von Rautenfels was the ring-leader of a gang of persons who possessed a large collection of bombs and infernal machines. Mr. Ihlen, the Foreign Secretary, stated in the Storting that these bombs had been imported into Norway by Baron Rautenfels in trunks bearing the seal of the Berlin Foreign Office and addressed to the German Legation in Christiania. This, said the Minister, was a violation of Norwegian territory, and an abuse of a courier's privileges, and a protest had accordingly been sent to Berlin. The German reply to the Norse Note was a qualified apology. It was stated that the Foreign Office had given no instructions for the sending of bombs in the courier's luggage, and that von Rautenfels had been dismissed. On the other hand, the German Government maintained that it was legitimate to send war-materials across a neutral country. These bombs, it was declared, were required for a certain war-like purpose, but were not to be used on Norwegian territory.

On July 15 a great fire broke out in the port of Trondhjem, and enormous quantities of timber and corn were destroyed. The total damage was estimated at about 3,000,000£.

During the year Norway suffered from the prevailing scarcity of food, the quantity of corn available being particularly inadequate. Mr. Knudsen, the Premier, speaking in the Stort-

ing in November, announced that there was a possibility of securing a supply of corn from Denmark, in which country the quantity of cereals was adequate, though the supplies of meat were low.

At the end of November a conference of the Scandinavian Kings took place in Christiania. A banquet was given at the royal palace on November 28, and in speeches made on that occasion the three sovereigns emphasised the cordial relations existing between all Scandinavians. King Gustav, in particular, said that a new and different union had now taken the place of the dissolved political union recently existing between Sweden and Norway.

CHAPTER V.

SOUTHERN ASIA.

I CYPRUS.

No incidents of importance occurred in this island during the year, but political agitation was rife among the Greek people, and with the spread of education, the desire for eventual union with the Hellenic Kingdom was becoming more general among the Greek majority of the population. The country continued to be very prosperous. It was announced that the value of the imports for 1916 was 976,958*l.*, and that the value of the exports for the same period was 720,592*l.* The figures for the imports represented an increase of over 50 per cent. on those for the preceding year, and the exports also showed a large increase.

II. THE HEJAZ

It will be remembered that during 1916 the Grand Shereef of Mecca, Hussein Ibu Ali, who was the greatest of the Arabian chiefs, had declared himself independent of Turkey, and had taken the title of King of the Hejaz¹. It is pleasant to be able to record that the principality was able to maintain its separate existence throughout the year; and there appeared to be little likelihood that the crumbling Ottoman power would be able to reassert itself over this region.

III PERSIA.

The Shah's Government had maintained its neutrality throughout the war, but this circumstance had not saved the territory of this weak monarchy from being over-run by the armed hosts of its belligerent neighbours. Indecisive fighting had occurred intermittently for many months between a Russian Army (under the command of General Baratoff)

¹ The title "Sultan of Arabia" which the Shereef was reported to have claimed originally, does not seem to have been retained.

which was based upon Tabriz, and a Turkish Army based upon Bagdad. At the end of 1916 the Turks held the town of Hamadan, and the surrounding country. In the meantime, the British had intervened in Southern Persia. General Sir Percy Sykes was commissioned to form a force of military police for Southern Persia, and he landed at Bunder Abbas in March, 1916. At the head of a small force, he proceeded to Kirman, and there he made the preparations for the formation of the proposed gendarmerie. From Kirman he moved on to Ispahan, and thence proceeded to Teheran itself. The presence of a British force in the Persian capital naturally had the effect of increasing the influence of the British over the Shah's Government. The full details of Sir Percy Sykes' expedition were not made known until the spring of 1917. The aim was to raise a police force of 11,000 men, and 5,000 recruits had been obtained by February, 1917. It was stated that half the force was to be raised among the Bakhtiari tribesmen, who had always maintained friendly relations with the Government of India. After leaving Teheran, Sir Percy Sykes established his headquarters at Shiraz.

During the first few months of the year General Baratoff's army recovered much ground which had been lost. On March 2 the Russians entered Hamadan. A few days later Harunabad was also taken. The Russians advanced rapidly, and at the beginning of April they established contact with Sir Stanley Maude's columns in Mesopotamia. The communications were never very secure, however, and at the beginning of July the Russian Revolutionary Government announced that General Baratoff's force had been withdrawn.

The Russian Revolution caused unbounded rejoicing in Persia, particularly in the province of Azerbaijan, which had been occupied by Russian troops for several years. It was felt that now at last the Persians were free to develop their own political institutions, without a continual dread of the great tyranny. The people began to voice their demands for the convocation of the Majlis (legislature), the organisation of a better system of elections, and for the pardoning of members of the legislature who had been banished. It was also hoped that the Shah would appoint a new Cabinet, who would endeavour honestly to preserve Persian independence, and would be subservient neither to Russia nor to Great Britain.

In the Russo-German peace negotiations at the end of the year it was proposed that both the Russian and the Turkish troops should completely evacuate Persia.

IV. AFGHANISTAN.

It was reported in May that Turco-German agents were fomenting unrest in Afghanistan, and were instigating the chiefs to make incursions into Russian Turkestan. These intrigues appear to have had no success, however, and up to the

end of the year there had been no indications that the loyalty of the Ameer to the Indian Government had been in the least shaken

V BOKHARA AND KHIVA.

In April, owing to the influence of the Russian Revolution, the Khan of Bokhara and the Khan of Khiva issued edicts granting democratic constitutions to their respective principalities.

VI. INDIA.

As the great war progressed, it spread its evil influence outwards from the original storm-centre in Europe to the other continents, and nations who were at first untouched became involved one by one. Yet it was a fact, and from the point of view of humanity perhaps a cheering fact, that the two largest communities in the world were but very slightly affected by the accumulating miseries of Europe. India, like China, was belligerent, but in both cases the belligerency was nominal rather than real. India's contribution in men and money for the purposes of the war were trifling in proportion to the vast dimensions of that great and populous sub-continent. The daily life of the people of Hindustan, of whom the great majority were, it must be remembered, illiterate and extremely poor peasants, was undisturbed by the unprecedented sufferings of sundered Christendom.

Thus the history of India during 1917 is somewhat uneventful, and a quiet and steady growth of material prosperity has once more to be recorded. The financial conditions of the sub-continent, whether Imperial, Provincial, or individual, continued to be satisfactory. The annual financial statement of the Government of India was presented to the Viceroy's Legislative Council by the Finance Minister, Sir W. S. Meyer, on March 1. The revised estimates of the revenue and expenditure for the financial year 1916-17 were then stated to be as follows:—

Imperial Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	£61,883,100
Provincial Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	31,951,400
							<hr/>
							Total - - - - - £96,834,500
Imperial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	£59,065,600
Provincial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,389,900
							<hr/>
							Total - - - - - £89,455,500

A sum of 1,561,500*l.* had, however, also been expended from the Provincial balances, so that the total expenditure, including this sum, amounted to 91,017,000*l.*, leaving a surplus of 5,817,500*l.* The revenue was over 10,000,000*l.* in excess of that forecasted twelve months before. The receipts from railways had been over 4,000,000*l.* greater than had been anticipated;

and the opium, salt, and income taxes had also brought in funds in excess of expectations. Owing to these satisfactory conditions, it was found possible to repay a temporary loan of 4,000,000*l.*, which had been taken from the Gold Standard Reserve in 1914-15.

Passing on to the Budget of 1917-18, the following were the chief figures given out:—

Imperial Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	£66,563,000
Provincial Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,287,900
							<hr/>
							Total - - - £98,850,900
Imperial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	£66,433,200
Provincial Expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,386,100
							<hr/>
							Total - - - £98,819,300

A sum of 98,200*l.* was, however, also to be withdrawn from Provincial balances, so that the total expenditure to be met out of revenue was 98,721,100*l.*, thus leaving an Imperial surplus of 129,800*l.*

The anticipated increases in revenue were due to extra taxes which were to be levied; the yield of the Income Tax was expected to increase by 1,541,200*l.* and an addition of over 700,000*l.* was forecasted from the Customs. In the expenditure the chief item was, of course, that relating to the Army, and the total of the military expenditure was no less than 25,900,000*l.* The Budget also provided for an expenditure of 6,000,000*l.* for interest and sinking fund on the Indian War Loan and on the portion of the British Government War Debt of which India was undertaking the charges. A supertax was imposed upon large incomes, in accordance with the following scale:—

On first Rs. 50,000 of total income	-	-	-	No supertax.
On second Rs. 50,000	"	"	-	1 anna per rupee.
On third Rs. 50,000	"	"	-	1½ annas "
On fourth Rs. 50,000	"	"	-	2 annas "
On fifth Rs. 50,000	"	"	-	2½ annas "
On any balance	"	"	-	3 annas "

In his speech to the House, Sir William Meyer said that the current surplus was due to the exceptionally favourable monsoon and to the remarkable growth of railway receipts. The import duty on cotton would be raised from 3½ per cent. to 7½ per cent., whilst the cotton excise duty would remain at 3½ per cent. The forthcoming Indian War Loan would comprise three branches; firstly, a 5 per cent. loan issued at 95, redeemable 1929-47; secondly, war bonds, at 5½ per cent., free of income tax, at an issue price of Rs. 100, these being in two series repayable in 1920 and 1922 respectively; and thirdly, Post Office five year cash certificates, 10s. 4d. becoming 13s. 4d. on maturity five years later. Subscriptions to the cash-certificates would be admissible indefinitely from April 1, and the war loan and the war bonds would be open for subscriptions

from March 15 to June 15. The Indian Government had decided to give the British Government a War Contribution of 100,000,000/-.

In February the Indian Government issued an Ordinance which was of great practical interest to all the British residing in India. This Ordinance instituted compulsory military service for all men, being British subjects of European origin, between the ages of 16 and 50. The scheme followed the lines of those previously adopted in Ceylon and the Straits Settlements. The Ordinance repealed the section of the Indian Volunteer Act of 1869, under which a member of any corps of Volunteers was only liable for service within a limited district. All Europeans, unless expressly exempted, between the ages of 16 and 50, would be deemed to be enrolled in a corps of Volunteers. Youths between 16 and 18 would be liable to compulsory military training; men between 18 and 41 would be liable for military service in any part of India, and men between 41 and 50 to local military service. Attendance at drills would be compulsory. During training and while stationed in their own localities and pursuing their ordinary avocations, men would be under the Volunteer Act of 1869, but when called up for duty they would come under the provisions of the Army Act. The Ordinance provided for the exemption of men who would otherwise come under military service on the ground of employment in high office, or necessary work in the national interest, of clergymen and ministers of religion, and, of course, of men not physically fit. Special authorities were to be set up to decide claims to exemption. The definition of a European subject of the Crown adopted for the purposes of this Ordinance was that of the Criminal Procedure Code, and included not only the British proper and men from the Dominions temporarily resident in India for official, professional, mercantile, or other work, but also persons of mixed descent (now known officially as "Anglo-Indians") whose fathers or grandfathers were born or domiciled in the United Kingdom or the Dominions. The definition thus included Eurasians who might be only one quarter European in blood. It was expected that about 18,000 persons would come within the provisions of the new Ordinance.

The Ordinance thus promulgated by the Government had the force of law, but it was confirmed by a Bill, which was introduced in the Legislative Council on February 21. General Sir Charles Monro, the Commander-in-Chief, introduced the Bill, which was named the Indian Defence Bill. The Act, he said, would remain in force until six months after the end of the war. There would be a system of relief, and the new volunteer units would relieve Regulars on garrison duty. Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, said that compulsion for Indians was impracticable. The Act applied not only to residents in British India, but to residents in the native states as well. It did not apply, however, to persons not "ordinarily resident" in India,

that is, it was not applicable to visitors. Provision was made at the same time for the optional enrolment of Indians, including any Eurasian whose European progenitor was more than two generations back, in special Volunteer regiments.

On February 7 Lord Chelmsford made a speech in the Legislative Council, in which he dealt with the question of military service, and also with the problem of emigration. He declared that regarding the abolition of the system of emigration of indentured labour, neither the Government of India nor the Secretary of State for India would depart from the pledge given by Lord Hardinge, but the whole question of abolition required much inquiry and investigation, in order to guard against a bad system being succeeded by a worse. The various local Governments had been consulted and replies were being received. A special mission had been sent to Ceylon and the Malay States, and its report was expected before the end of February. The Government intended that a Conference consisting of representatives of Indian and Colonial interests should meet in London, probably in May, to formulate a scheme which would be acceptable to both parties. The Colonial Office had accepted the decision that in its present form emigration must cease, and the colonies concerned were showing the utmost readiness to co-operate and to remove the objectionable features of the present system. The Government of India would presently undertake whatever legislation was found to be necessary in a wholly sympathetic spirit, but for the present he asked the Council to be satisfied with this assurance.

At the beginning of March two new appointments to Provincial governorships were made. Sir Spencer Harcourt Butler, K.C.S.I., was transferred from Burma and appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, in succession to Sir James Meston; and Sir Reginald Henry Craddock, K.C.S.I., was made Lieutenant-Governor of Burma. Sir James Meston came to England, and was one of the Representatives of India at the Special War Conference of the Empire held in London in the spring.

Whilst he was Lieutenant-Governor of Burma Sir Harcourt Butler appointed a committee to consider current proposals to enlarge the Burma Legislative Council and to increase the elective element in its composition. This committee issued a report early in the year, and stated therein that the Burmese did not desire any extension of the elective principle, and that, moreover, the peasantry were too ignorant to profit by the application of the principle, which they would not be able to understand. They recommended that there should be only six elected non-official members.

In June a further advance was made by the British Government in associating Indians with the governance of their own country. Mr. Austen Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for India, appointed Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan and Sir Prab-

hashankai Dalpatram Pattani, K C I.E., to be members of the Council of India in succession to Sir A. A. Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., and Raja Daljit Singh, C.S.I., respectively. In addition Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu was appointed a member of the Council. Hitherto there had never been more than two Indian members of the Council. Mr. Nath Basu was a well-known publicist and had previously been a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council.

At the end of July a joint meeting of the Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Council of the Moslem League was held at Bombay, delegates being present from all parts of India. A resolution was adopted demanding that the Imperial Government should pledge itself to the policy of making India a self-governing unit in the Empire, and should direct the servants of the Crown in India to work honestly for the realisation of that aim in the near future. The meeting also demanded that Mrs. Besant, who had been imprisoned for agitating in favour of Home Rule for India, should be released forthwith.

During the spring and summer there was a recrudescence of the chronic trouble with the tribes on the North-West Frontier. The chief trouble was caused by the Mahsuds, a warlike tribe dwelling in the mountains south-west of Peshawar. The Mahsuds were able to dispose of an army of 10,000 well-armed men. On May 1 they attacked a convoy between Nili-Kach and Khajuri Kach, about 160 miles from Peshawar. They were beaten off, but not before they had caused over 100 British casualties, including two white officers killed. After this incident the Waziristan Field Force, under the general direction of Sir Charles Monro, was sent on a punitive expedition into the Mahsud country. Aeroplanes were employed for the first time in Indian warfare. The Anglo-Indian force penetrated into the Shahur Valley, and by the beginning of July the Mahsuds sued for peace. As a condition of peace the tribesmen were compelled to hand over their rifles. It was announced at the end of July that the British had had 501 casualties, killed, missing, and wounded, in tribal warfare during the past twelve months.

At the opening of the Legislative Council of India on September 7, Lord Chelmsford made a long speech. He said that the Imperial Government had consented to adopt the principle of granting Army Commissions to Indians. In regard to Constitutional reform, this must proceed along three lines: the reform of local self-government in villages and towns, the more responsible employment of Indians by the Executive, and, thirdly, the development of the Legislative Councils. On these questions he could not anticipate the decisions of the British Government, more particularly as Mr. Montagu, the new Secretary of State for India, was about to visit the country and would then investigate these problems. In regard to Mrs.

Besant's case, the Viceroy said that Lord Pentland (the Governor of Madras) had taken action with great reluctance, after having failed to dissuade the lady from pursuing her seditious activities. In the matter of finance, subscriptions to the Indian War Loan, recently issued, had exceeded 32,000,000^l. On the North-West Frontier, the Mahsuds had been thoroughly chastised, and the Government of India had had cause to be grateful to the Ameer of Afghanistan, who had discouraged the raiders.

Before the end of September it was announced that Mrs. Besant had been released, and that she had given an assurance to the Viceroy that she would assist in maintaining a calm atmosphere during the forthcoming visit to India of Mr Montagu.

During the summer an Inter-Departmental Conference was held in London to consider the question of Indian emigration, the conference being presided over by Lord Islington, Under-Secretary for India. Sir A. Steel-Maitland represented the Colonial Office. A scheme¹ was drawn up for the assisted colonisation of Indians in British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica, and Fiji, this scheme being intended to take the place of the indentured system which was being abolished. The object of the scheme was to encourage Indians to emigrate to the colonies concerned, where, after a probationary period, they would be also encouraged to settle permanently. Whole families, especially families containing young unmarried girls, would be given facilities to migrate.

Speaking in the Imperial Legislature on September 13, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, gave some interesting statistics relating to recruiting in India. He said that 276,000 Indians had enlisted as combatants during the previous three years, and that of these no fewer than 155,000 had been recruited in the Punjab.

Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, arrived at Bombay on November 9. He held many conferences with the leading members of the British bureaucracy, native politicians, and ruling princes, and made a thorough examination of the system of Indian administration. No report on the Minister's conclusions and recommendations had been published up to the end of the year.

It will be remembered that about six months after the outbreak of war the death of the celebrated Indian politician, Mr. Gokhale, had occurred. Through the instrumentality of the Aga Khan, the last political memorandum of this brilliant Indian, containing general recommendations for the government of Hindustan, was published in August.² The document was extraordinarily interesting. Its chief recommendation was that a very wide measure of provincial autonomy should be instituted,

¹ Published fully in *The Times* on September 1
² See *The Times*, August 15.

India thus becoming a federation of largely independent states. An extension of the elective principle was advocated, but nothing in the nature of extreme democracy was proposed. Mr. Gokhale wished to see the control of the India Office reduced.

The Report of the Royal Commission on the Public Services in India, appointed in 1912, was issued on January 26. Lord Islington was Chairman of the Commission. The report entered into the subjects discussed in great detail, but its most important recommendations were that the majority of the officers of the Civil Service and the Police ought in the future, as in the past, to be Europeans, but that Indians should be more generally employed on scientific and technical work; also that the age-limit for the competitive examination in London should be reduced to 17-19, and be followed by three years' probation.

VII. SIAM.

In July the Siamese Government declared war upon Germany and Austria-Hungary, and announced its intention of assisting the Powers who were "fighting for the rights of small nations." All subjects of the Central Powers living in Siam were immediately arrested, and their businesses were closed. Nine vessels having an aggregate tonnage of nearly 19,000 tons were seized; and it was announced in Bangkok that the Government hoped to send an expeditionary force to France.

CHAPTER VI

THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN.

I. CHINA

It was remarked in the last number of the ANNUAL REGISTER that it was often forgotten in Europe that wide though the extent of the great war was, and fraught though the contest undoubtedly was with important issues for mankind, yet the largest community in the world remained without the flames of the conflagration and was almost completely unaffected by it. In the year now under consideration China became nominally a belligerent in the world-war, but the detachment of the Chinese from the struggle was, in many respects, hardly modified by that fact. The private lives of the myriads were unchanged: none of the sufferings of war came to them. China was so vast, so populous, and, within the wide limits of her own peculiar civilisation, so varied, that she formed almost a world apart. Yet the action of the Chinese state in entering the war was probably destined to bear more significant and important results to itself, ultimately, than a mere temporary and accidental opposition to one group of European Powers and a temporary and accidental alliance with the other group of white

nations. China's relations to the eight large states which we call the Great Powers of the world were altered in an important manner, and in a way which bid fair to be more than temporary, and to bring her more into a condition of tutelage and more under the influence of her relatively small but energetic neighbour, Japan.

It will be remembered that the previous year had been marked by the premature death of Yuan-Shih-Kai, President of the Republic, one of the few really great Chinamen of recent years. He had been succeeded by the Vice-President, General Li Yuan-Hung, a much less gifted man, but one who—possibly for that very reason—was much more content with the Republican regime, and who had the support of the leaders of the Southern Provinces. The leaders of the South had been in open revolt against Yuan-Shih-Kai's authority. In the Chinese Republic the office of Prime Minister was quite separate from the Presidency, and the Premier under Li Yuan-Hung was Tuan-Chi-Jui.

Now up to the end of 1916 China's relations with the belligerent Powers had been almost entirely unaffected by the war. The Chinese exhibited no special preference for either one side or the other. They were on very civil terms with the British, but Yuan-Shih-Kai had no quarrel with the Germans, whom, in truth, he was somewhat disposed to favour, chiefly owing to their hostility to the Japanese. The latter were disliked and feared by most Chinese statesmen who were sincerely anxious to preserve the full independence of their country, for Japan, rightly or wrongly, was suspected by many of harbouring aggressive designs. Of all the Powers the United States held much the most favoured position with the Chinese Government. The Americans were credited with honourable, pacific, and unaggressive intentions towards China, and as recently as the previous year the refusal of the United States to interfere in the hot domestic controversy around the proposal to restore the Monarchy had made a good impression in Peking, where the advice tendered by Japan, and seconded by the Quadruple Entente, had not been altogether welcomed. Thus it came about that when the United States took action against Germany over the submarine issue, China, which had hitherto remained rigidly neutral and had been uninfluenced by the Entente, decided to follow the lead of her occidental friend, and accordingly broke off diplomatic relations with Berlin. Further, when America at last entered the war, a flock of sundry weak states, of every colour and every magnitude, came straggling into the conflict in her train; and amongst this flock was the Chinese Republic.

Early in January the Government issued a reply to President Wilson's peace note, in which agreement with America's international aims was expressed, and it was declared that China was willing and desirous to co-operate with other states in de-

vising political arrangements for the preservation of the peace of the world.

When the German Government announced the new submarine campaign, the Chinese Government sent a strong protest to Berlin, stating that unless the proposed maritime measures were cancelled or modified, the Government would be compelled to sever relations with Germany. A note was also sent to Washington in reply to Dr Wilson's invitation to all neutrals to break with the offending Power, and in this it was stated that China was completely in accord with the attitude adopted by the United States. The actual severance was delayed for several weeks owing to the opposition of certain politicians, notably the Vice-President, Fong-Kuo-Chang. The President himself was very doubtful what course ought to be pursued, but the Premier strongly favoured severance. Parliament met on March 10 to hear a statement from the Government on diplomatic policy, and the Ministry having explained their intentions, both Houses passed votes of confidence by large majorities. On the same day the German Minister in Peking handed to the Foreign Office a note in reply to China's protest, this note stating that although the Imperial Government could not alter their submarine measures, efforts would be made to safeguard Chinese lives and property; but both the Government and the legislature deemed this reply altogether unsatisfactory. On March 14 the German Minister was duly informed that the German note had not met the Chinese requirements, and was handed his passports. In addition to the members of the German Legation at Peking, the German Consular officials at the Treaty Ports were also dismissed, and on March 26 the Chinese Minister in Berlin asked for his passports. The German ships at Shanghai were seized, and it was announced that China would make Germany no further payments on account of the Boxer Rebellion Indemnity. Payments of the German portions of Anglo-German loans to China were also to cease. The Government did not, however, follow up these actions by immediately declaring war on Germany.

During the summer China passed through a series of violent political crises. Tuan-Chi-Jui, the Premier, was an ambitious man, and he seems to have aimed at making himself President, or even Dictator. He quarrelled with every member of his own Cabinet, and finally, in May, he found himself the only remaining member of the Ministry. He incurred the hostility of Parliament, but his position was strengthened by the support of the Military Governors of some of the Northern Provinces. The President went in fear of the army commanders, but on May 23 he took what was clearly the Constitutional course and dismissed Tuan-Chi-Jui. The latter announced, however, that he would not accept this decree, and he hastily left Peking for Tientsin, where the local troops were known to be friendly to him. Generals Lung-Chi-Kwang and Lu Yung-ting, who were

with their garrisons at Canton, were also reported to be supporters of Tuan-Chi-Jui. The President appointed Wu Ting-fang as temporary head of the Cabinet with the title of Acting Prime Minister.

Tuan-Chi-Jui proved to have very wide support in the provinces. A number of Military Governors and Provincial Executives declared that the President had exceeded his powers in dismissing the Premier. The Governors of Anhui, Shantung, Chihli, Shansi, Fengtien, Hupeh, Honan, Chekiang, and Fukien declared themselves "independent" of the Peking Government, an announcement which is never to be taken at its face value in China, since it is there merely a method of expressing forcible opposition to the Central Administration, and does not imply that the country is really splitting up into its component parts.

The situation rapidly became more complex. Parliament elected Li Ching-hsi, an adopted son of the great Li Hung-Chang, to be Prime Minister, but this politician refused to serve in that capacity. Tuan-Chi-Jui and the Governments of the revolting provinces demanded the dissolution of Parliament. They declared that Parliament was unwilling to declare war on Germany. The truth was, however, that the legislature had been willing to sanction war with Germany, but not until Tuan-Chi-Jui had accepted his dismissal from office. At the beginning of June a serious possibility of civil war existed. The Northern Party, or "Militarists," established a Provisional Government at Tientsin, which included Hsu Shih-Chang, as Dictator (or Provisional President), Wang Shih-Cheng, as Premier, Thao-Ju Lin, as Foreign Minister, and Tung Hua-Lung, as Minister of the Interior. General Chang Hsun acted in close association with this Provisional Cabinet of the North. The Militarist leader, General Nieh Shih-chun, Governor of Anhui, announced that unless the President dissolved Parliament, he himself would be dismissed and driven out by the Provisional Government. Nieh Shih-chun said, however, that his party had no intention of restoring the Manchu dynasty.

The Southern Provinces showed a desire to support Li Yuan-Hung, but the President deemed it expedient to meet the demands of the Militarists, and on June 12 he signed a decree dissolving both Houses of Parliament. The decree was countersigned by General Chiang Tao-tung, who had become momentarily the Acting Prime Minister of the Administration in Peking. Meanwhile, General Chang Hsun had been invited by the President to go to Peking in order that he might mediate between the two "Governments." The General did not at first proceed to the capital himself, but sent several thousands of his troops instead, and these forces seized strategic points near Peking. The Southern Provinces demanded that the decree dissolving Parliament should be cancelled. Towards the end of June Chang Hsun consented to go to Peking. He seems to have

made a show of endeavouring to help the President to arrange a new Cabinet, but there was difficulty in obtaining a suitable Premier, since Li Ching-hsi, who had been elected Premier by Parliament, refused to serve owing to the opposition which he knew his policy would receive from the Militarists. Wu Ting-fang, who had been appointed Premier by the President, had resigned because he could not agree to counter-sign the decree dissolving Parliament. Chiang Tao-tung, being commander of the Manchu troops in the capital, was unacceptable to the Militarists, and Tuan Chi-Jui refused to resume office.

The conflict between the parties was not of a purely trivial or merely personal character. It did not arise only out of the personal hostility of the President and the leaders of the legislature towards the overbearing Premier, Tuan Chi-Jui. The Northern leaders advocated amendments in the Constitution with the object of giving the Executive more freedom from the constant supervision of the Diet, and they also held that the powers of the President should be curtailed. And they hoped to attain these ends by a dissolution of Parliament, since they thought that a newly elected Parliament would be more favourable to their policy. Li Yuan-Hung having dissolved Parliament and agreed to the proposal to amend the Constitution, the Governments of Chihli, Shantung, Fengtien, and Honan announced that their "declarations of independence" were withdrawn.

These incidents were followed by a dramatic, though very brief, restoration of the Monarchy. General Chang Hsun had been quietly concentrating an overpowering force of troops in the vicinity of the metropolis, and by a sudden *coup d'état* on July 1, he seized control of Peking and announced to the world that the young prince, Hsuan-Tung, had been restored to the throne of China. The prince was only 10 years of age at this time. It was announced that it was proposed to establish a Constitutional Monarchy, that all foreign treaties and loans would be duly recognised, that a Diet of Elder Statesmen would be instituted, and that an amnesty towards political prisoners would be issued.

Various appointments were also made. General Chang Hsun was nominated Viceroy of Chihli and Imperial Commissioner in North China, and Fong Kuo-chang, lately Vice-President, was made Viceroy of Liang Kiang and Imperial Commissioner in South China. A small Imperial Cabinet, which included Liang Tun-Yen as Foreign Minister, was also formed. The restoration endured only a few days. No prominent man except Chang Hsun supported it, and that General soon found himself facing the active hostility of the adherents of the South China Party, and also of his own former friends the Militarists. Tuan Chi-Jui, with characteristic energy, put himself at the head of the armies of the Northern Provinces and marched on Peking. In a few days the city was surrounded by about

40,000 Republican troops. The forces on both sides were well armed in modern fashion, and the Republicans possessed several aeroplanes. On July 7, one of the aeroplanes flew over Peking dropping bombs, and on the same day it became known that the Emperor would abdicate. Some fighting took place at Fengtai, 10 miles from Peking, Chang Hsun's troops being defeated, and thereafter retreating into Peking itself. The Republicans published a proclamation offering \$100,000 for the capture of Chang Hsun, alive or dead. On the night of July 11 there was a battle for Peking; the firing was noisy and the aeroplanes took part, but the casualties on both sides were very few. Ten soldiers were killed. Early in the morning of the 12th the Republicans entered the capital, easily overcoming the feeble resistance which they encountered. Chang Hsun took refuge in the Dutch Legation, and his men surrendered *en masse* on being promised three months' pay from their enemies. Serious fires broke out in the city, but otherwise the damage done was slight, and no harm befell the European Legations. Whilst these events were taking place the President was a refugee in the Japanese Legation in Peking.

The Republican Government was then re-established and reorganised, with Tuan Chi-Jui once more acting as Premier. Wang Ta-Hsieh became Foreign Minister and Lin Kuan-Hsung assumed the office of Minister of Marine. The new Government exercised very little authority south of the Yangtsze, however, where the autocratic methods of Tuan Chi-Jui continued to be much disliked. Li Yuan-Hung, perceiving that recent events had strengthened the position of his enemy, Tuan Chi-Jui, steadily repelled all efforts to induce him to reassume the Presidency, and his place was therefore taken by Fen Kuo-Chang.

The real ruler of the country was now not the President but the Premier. The office of the former was reduced in importance not by any actual changes in the Constitution, but by the mere assertion of authority by the stronger man. After reassuming office Tuan Chi-Jui issued a manifesto stating that the Republic needed an organ for the expression of the will of the people, but that the organ hitherto existing had been unsatisfactory and had been privy to the attempt to restore the Monarchy. A new and better organ would, according to the manifesto, shortly be brought into existence, and this new Parliament would be "suited to the present condition of the people."

There appeared to be little or no foundation for Tuan Chi-Jui's accusation that the legislature had instigated the restoration of Prince Hsuan-Tung. Li Yuan-Hung, the majority in Parliament, and the South China Party generally had acted together, and they had not been allied to General Chang Hsun. On the contrary, they probably believed more sincerely in republican institutions than did Tuan Chi-Jui and the Northern Militarists. As for the Chinese people, neither the old Parliament nor the

proposed new Parliament could be expected to "express their will," for they could not be truly said to have any will in political affairs. All these events passed over the heads of the Chinese masses uncomprehended and for the most part unheeded. China, though a republic, was in no sense a democracy.

On August 13, after full consultation between the President and the Cabinet, China at last declared war upon Germany, and a similar declaration was sent to Vienna. Up to this time diplomatic relations had been maintained with Austria-Hungary. The proclamation announcing this decision stated also that all treaties, agreements, and conventions with the two Powers were abrogated. The Austro-Hungarian ships in Chinese ports were seized, but the total value of these was small.

The declaration of war and the whole policy of the Cabinet remained unpopular with the Southern leaders, and a rebellion broke out in Honan. In the middle of November the Prime Minister resigned, and Wang Ta-hsieh, the Foreign Minister, became Acting Premier. This statesman was at the head of the Cabinet for a few days only, and at the beginning of December Wang Shih-cheng became Prime Minister for the second time in the year. His Cabinet included Lu Cheng-hsiang (Foreign Affairs), Tseng-Neng-kun (Interior), Wang-Ke-tien (Finance), and Liu Kuan-Hsung (Admiralty).

It was announced in November that General Chang Hsun was to be exiled.

In the autumn the Entente Powers announced that they would consent to the postponement of the payment of the Boxer indemnity for five years, in consideration of the fact that China had declared war upon the Central Powers.

At the end of the year the political situation was extremely unstable. The Government had little control over the Southern Provinces, and were also embarrassed by the hostility of the faction led by Tuan Chi-Jui.

II. JAPAN.

The year was somewhat uneventful in Japan. Although the Empire was a member, and one of the most important members, of the Entente group of Powers, it played only a very small part in the war. A fleet of destroyers was dispatched to the Mediterranean, and there performed useful service against the hostile submarines, and the manufacture of munitions was continued, but no direct military aid was given to the Allies. The question of sending a Japanese Army to Europe was debated in governing circles more than once, but was always dismissed as impracticable, if not as undesirable.

On January 23, Mr. Shoda, the Minister of Finance, introduced the Budget for 1917-18 into the Imperial Parliament. The revenue and expenditure were estimated to balance at 60,405,000 £ ., the ordinary expenditure being estimated at

49,357,000*l.* The sinking fund to be provided out of revenue was 5,000,000*l.*, and in addition a sum of 3,000,000*l.* was to be raised by a domestic loan for the purpose of cancelling Japanese foreign debt. It was also proposed to raise several other domestic loans. Thus, 1,307,000*l.* was required for expenditure upon public works in Korea, and 336,000*l.* was similarly demanded for the carrying out of public works in Formosa. Another loan of 2,186,000*l.* was to be raised in order to meet proposed capital expenditure upon the Imperial Railway. It was stated that the foreign trade of Japan during the previous year had attained the highest figures on record. The exports had amounted to 112,700,000*l.* and the imports to 75,600,000*l.*

On January 23 Viscount Motono, the Foreign Minister, delivered an important and comprehensive speech in Parliament. Japan, he said, was a loyal ally, and would stand by her friends until complete victory had been won. The conflict extended to all departments of human activity, and for that reason Japan adhered to the resolutions of the Paris Economic Conference. Japan had also adhered to the recent Entente replies to the German and the American peace proposals. In addition to the Allied terms mentioned in the reply to Dr. Wilson, Japan preserved a free hand in regard to the German colonies in the East. The alliance with Great Britain was the corner-stone of Japanese foreign policy, and the recent convention with Russia was highly advantageous to both Empires. The Viscount referred at length to China, and said that Japan had very special interests in Southern Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, but he deprecated interference by individual Japanese in Chinese party politics.

The parliamentary situation at the opening of the year was extremely unstable. Marshal Terauchi had become Prime Minister in the previous October, but his immediate followers did not constitute a majority of the Lower House. The strongest party in the House of Representatives was the Kenseikai, who were led by Viscount Kato. The latter politician possessed a small majority in the House, but the Government hoped that he would not use his power to eject them from office, as he was believed to be friendly disposed towards the Premier. Between the formation of the Terauchi Ministry and the end of the year no session of the Legislature was held.

In the event, however, the hostility of the Kenseikai to the Ministry broke out in spite of the restraining influence of Viscount Kato, and at the end of January the Ministry found themselves in a minority in the Lower House. The Premier therefore advised the Mikado to dissolve Parliament. The Kenseikai alleged that Marshal Terauchi had assumed office in October in an unconstitutional manner, since the Mikado had sent for Terauchi on the advice of the Genro (Elder Statesmen), who, according to the Kenseikai, ought not to have interfered

in the matter. The retiring Premier, Count Okuma, had recommended the Emperor to send for Viscount Kato, and the Kenseikai alleged that the sovereign was under a Constitutional obligation to follow the advice of the outgoing Premier in preference to that of the Genro.

The elections took place on April 20 and the Government obtained a majority. Marshal Terauchi's own followers, the Seiyukai, obtained 163 seats, the Kenseikai won 122, and the Kokumin-to (the so-called Popular Party) were returned only 36 strong. In addition, 58 Independent members were elected, the House of Representatives consisting of 379 members. Nearly all the Independents were regarded as supporters of the Government, so that Marshal Terauchi's position now appeared fairly secure.

When Parliament met again in June the Premier announced that he proposed to institute a committee of all parties to supervise foreign policy. The aim, apparently, was to preserve complete national unity in external affairs by associating the leaders of all parties with the conduct of foreign policy. The proposal was not well received, however, and Viscount Kato refused a seat on the new committee. Mr. Inuka, leader of the Kokumin-to, became a member of the committee.

It was announced in March that Portugal had sold the port of Macao to Japan. Macao was one of the very oldest European possessions in the Far East, having been leased to Portugal by China since the year 1586.

It was announced in June that a special mission would be sent to the United States to confer with the American Government upon Chinese problems and other questions. Viscount Ishii, formerly Foreign Minister, was head of the mission. After the conferences had taken place, notes were exchanged between Mr. Lansing (American Secretary of State) and Viscount Ishii setting forth the terms of the agreement reached between the two countries. The two notes were dated November 2. Mr. Lansing's note stated that the American Government recognised that territorial propinquity created special relations between countries, and consequently recognised that Japan had special interests in China. Nevertheless, the American Government considered that the territorial sovereignty of China remained unimpaired, and understood that the Japanese Government agreed that neither Government should infringe upon the integrity of China, and that any such infringement by any other Power should be opposed. The Governments also agreed to adhere to the principle of the so-called "open door" for trade in China. Viscount Ishii's note confirmed, with verbal exactitude, the statements on the agreement made in Mr. Lansing's communication.

CHAPTER VII

AFRICA

I. THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

THE political history of South Africa in 1917 is full of interest, by reason of the fact that in this year, as always in Afrikanerdom, the issues dividing parties were real and fundamental issues, and not mere matters of detail. It will be remembered that the South African Party, the party of Boer Imperialists led by General Botha, had returned from the general election of 1915 as a minority in the House of Assembly, but that General Botha had not resigned the Premiership and had since been maintained in power by the goodwill of the Unionists (the so-called "British" Party), who deeply appreciated the Prime Minister's enthusiastic attitude towards the European War. These two parties together possessed a large majority in the Lower House, and in spite of the fact that the Unionists had no representatives in the Cabinet, the co-operation between the parties was so close and cordial, that the onlooker tended to forget that Sir Thomas Smartt, the Unionist leader, was nominally Leader of the Opposition in the South African Parliament. The real opposition was to be found in an altogether different quarter. Some years before the general election the anti-imperialist section of the Boers, led by General Hertzog, had broken away from the Botha Party and had formed a separate organisation calling itself the "Nationalist" Party. These Nationalists were extreme anti-imperialists, and adopted an attitude comparable to that of the party of the same name in French-speaking Canada. They had opposed any active participation in the war, and, in particular, the invasion of German South-West Africa. They held that it was only incumbent upon South Africa to defend its own frontiers, and that apart from that duty, the dominion could remain neutral when Great Britain was at war. The Nationalists possessed only twenty-seven seats in the Lower House, the total membership of which was 130, but at the time of the general election they had possessed the support of slightly more than half the Dutch population of the Union. The Labour Party, also very weak in the House but less weak in the electorate, constituted a fourth party, and often co-operated on domestic questions with the Nationalists.

A trial of strength between the Imperialist Parties and the Nationalists took place in June, when the elections for the provincial councils were held. The Nationalists increased their representation in the councils. In the Cape Province they captured five seats hitherto held by the South African Party. In the case of the Transvaal Diet, the parties were returned in the following numbers: South African Party, 14; Nationalists, 12; Unionists, 10; Labourites, 8; and Independent, 1.

In the Orange Free State, the Nationalists were already in a large majority before the elections. The increase of the Nationalist strength was partly fictitious, being caused by the absence of many Imperialists on active service.

The Legislature was opened for the Spring Session by the Governor-General, Lord Buxton, on February 16. Lord Buxton referred to the services rendered to the Empire by South African troops, and said that he earnestly hoped that the Oversea Contingent would be maintained at full strength and even augmented.

At the beginning of the year, the question of the pay of the Oversea Contingent, which had agitated the country for many months, was finally decided. The Oversea Contingent, unlike the force which had operated in South-West Africa, had been paid at British or "Imperial" rates, not at South African rates. Now the rate of pay for British troops was much below the respective rates paid to the Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand troops, and to the South African troops in South Africa. The Unionists had advocated raising the pay of the Oversea Contingent up to the ordinary South African rate, but the Ministry, going in fear of the Nationalists, had refused to adopt this suggestion. At the beginning of the year, however, the British Government announced that they themselves would take over the responsibility of making up the pay of the South African Contingent from the Imperial rate to the Dominion rate.

At the end of February the report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the origins of the rebellion of 1914 was issued. The main conclusion of the Commissioners was that the chief cause of the rebellion was the existence of a lingering hope among many of the people of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State that their independence might ultimately be regained. The Anglo-German war was regarded as a good opportunity. The Commissioners found no evidence of any direct communication between the German Government at Windhuk and any of the Boer leaders, except the traitor, Maritz. But General Delarey plotted a rising almost as soon as war broke out, and the other extremists, Beyer, De Wet, and Kemp, were subsequently drawn into the conspiracy.

The finances of South Africa were in a state which was satisfactory in comparison with the conditions existing in certain other parts of the British Empire, including the United Kingdom. The Budget statement was made by Mr. Burton, the Finance Minister, on March 30. The ordinary expenditure for 1916-17 had been 17,900,000*l.* and the revenue 18,300,000*l.* There was thus a small surplus, in place of the small deficit which had been anticipated. The customs receipts and the diamond revenue had been larger than had been anticipated. The estimated revenue for 1917-18 was 18,170,000*l.* and the estimated ordinary expenditure was 18,423,000*l.* Certain minor

modifications in taxation were to be introduced. The special war-tax on gold-mining profits was to be discontinued. The diamond export duty was to be a flat rate of 5 per cent., giving an increased revenue of 170,000*l*. An excess-profits tax of 25 per cent. was to be imposed for the duration of the war and six months thereafter. The war expenditure was to fall, as previously, entirely upon loan account. It was stated that about 23,000,000*l* had been added to the debt of the dominion on account of war expenditure up to March 31, 1917. In South Africa the Railway Budget is completely separate from the ordinary general Budget, the railway revenue being applied exclusively to railway purposes. The railway revenue for 1916-17 was 16,100,000*l*, giving a surplus of nearly 700,000*l.* over the railway expenditure for that year.

One of the most important Acts passed during the session was the Bewaarplaatsen Moneys Bill. These bewaarplaatsen were mining areas over which the Crown had special rights. The Bill authorised the division of the proceeds of the bewaarplaatsen equally between the State and the freeholders.

At the end of the year a 5 per cent. loan was issued by the South African Government, the total subscriptions amounting to 5,500,000*l.*

During the summer the British Government took over the South African wool-clip, paying a price 55 per cent. in excess of the pre-war price of 1913-14. Some dissatisfaction was expressed with this action, on the ground that prices still more inflated had been obtainable from private purchasers earlier in the war, and the incident was used by the Nationalist propagandists as a grievance against Great Britain and against the Botha Ministry.

The most important political development during the year was probably the widening of the schism between the Nationalists and the other parties. As already explained, General Hertzog and the other leaders had propounded an extraordinary theory that South Africa was entitled to remain neutral when Great Britain was at war. This right was, contended General Hertzog, a necessary consequence of the possession of autonomy (*Zelfstandigheid*), even though South Africa owed allegiance to the sovereign who was also King of Great Britain. The proposition, which is very unfamiliar to British readers, was put forward as a definite Constitutional theory. Referring to the South African Union Act of 1909, General Hertzog said at Stellenbosch in May that "in no single essential respect can any difference be observed between our State Constitution and that of Great Britain," and that no real self-government could exist without independence of all other countries, including Great Britain. "We stand in no way under Great Britain or its Parliament or Government. The only bond which binds us together is our common King, but under him we each stand separately and independently of each other." The theory was

obviously destructive of anything which could properly be called imperial unity. So far as it was a consistent legal proposition, it appeared to imply that the sole significance of the possession of a common sovereign was that the states concerned should not go to war with each other. And General Hertzog appeared to argue that the war was not the King's war, but was the British Government's war, and as such was not the concern of South Africa.

The theory overlooked the fact that the British Government was legally an Imperial Government, with legally supreme powers over all the King's dominions. It might be the aim of Constitutional reformers to reduce Great Britain to the position of "Primus inter pares," but such was not her existing legal status. She was the imperial state, standing, in law, supreme over all other states.

That the position was seen by the Nationalists themselves to be untenable, would appear from the fact that this party decided formally to adopt Republicanism as a plank in their programme. It was hoped to achieve the aim by steady Constitutional propaganda, not by violence; and General Hertzog averred that the encouragement of this ideal was clearly legitimate in a British community, since Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen had repeatedly declared that in the new world which should arise after the war "small nations would have the right to decide their own destinies."

Nevertheless, in the Union House of Assembly a motion proposed by Mr. Merriman on June 18 condemning the Republican propaganda was carried by 72 votes to 21.

II. RHODESIA.

The settlers in this colony played an important part in the war in proportion to their numbers. The total adult male population of the colony was only 12,000, and of these over 4,000 were on service in the various theatres of military operations.

The financial position of Southern Rhodesia was favourable. It was stated that the estimated revenue for 1917-18 was 710,000*l.*, and the estimated expenditure 815,000*l.*, but the deficit was to be met by increased taxes on spirits and on entertainments.

On April 30 the Legislature of Southern Rhodesia passed a resolution by 9 votes to 6 declaring that it was desirable that Northern and Southern Rhodesia should be administered as one territory.

On September 29 a meeting was held at Bulawayo to inaugurate a movement the object of which was to secure responsible government for Southern Rhodesia. The meeting was enthusiastic, but much opposition was expressed to the idea of absorption in the South African Union.

III. NYASALAND.

No incident of importance occurred in this protectorate during the year. A small Nyasaland force served under General Northeby in the operations in German East Africa. The revenue for 1917-18 was estimated at 136,623*l.* and the expenditure at 154,830*l.*, the deficit being made up from a surplus obtained in the previous financial year.

IV. PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA

A serious native rising took place in this backward colony during the summer. Punitive expeditions were formed, and on July 17 an action was fought on the banks of the river Pungre between the Portuguese and the rebels. The latter were defeated, the Portuguese having two European soldiers killed and seven wounded. The rebels had many killed, and they subsequently fled into the interior and dispersed.

More serious fighting occurred in December. The German force which had been offering an obstinate resistance to the British in German East Africa was driven over the frontier into Portuguese territory. The German column was about 2,000 strong, and was commanded by General von Lettow-Vorbeck. On December 8 the Germans overwhelmed a Portuguese fort on Mount M'Kula, which was held by only 250 men, and captured ten machine guns from the Portuguese. The survivors of the little Portuguese force were captured, but were subsequently released.

V. PORTUGUESE WEST AFRICA

Early in the year the British Government issued a statement that the conditions of labour in San Thomé and Principé, once scandalously bad, had greatly improved, and that they hoped the boycott maintained by British firms against the produce of these islands would be removed. The firms to which reference was made were, of course, the great cocoa firms of England. Messrs. Cadbury were not satisfied with the evidence produced in the official report, and did not remove their boycott.

VI. GERMAN EAST AFRICA.

It will be remembered that before the end of 1916 the larger part of this great German colony had been conquered by British and Belgian forces. The German force had been driven away from the towns and the railways, but still maintained a show of resistance in the wild southern district of the colony. The actions which were fought were few and unimportant, and it was the extraordinary topographical difficulties which were presented by the tropical bush which caused the campaign to be so prolonged. The serious fighting having been completed, General Smuts, the famous Boer Imperialist who had been in

command of all the Britannic forces in East Africa, relinquished his command in January. He was succeeded by General van Deventer. The main German force was established in the hill country lying to the south-east of the port of Kilwa, about half-way between Dar-es-Salaam and the Portuguese frontier. Smaller bands were scattered about farther south, and some of them made incursions into Portuguese territory. During July and August small but sharp engagements took place, one of the most severe being on the banks of the Mihumbia, near Lindi, on August 3. The Germans were entrenched in thick bush and could not be dislodged on this occasion. In the final operations the main section of van Deventer's force was based upon Kilwa and was moving against the main German force under General von Lettow which was in the Matandu Valley. At the same time a concerted movement against a smaller German force under Colonel Tafel, holding Mahenge, was made by General Northey's column based on the head of Lake Nyasa, a Belgian force based on the central railway, and a small section of van Deventer's command based on Iringa. On October 9 the advancing Belgians occupied Mahenge. Meanwhile, a small force under Colonel Shorthose had accomplished a long and arduous march from the southern end of Lake Nyasa and across the Rovuma; and on November 15 this force engaged Tafel near Lwale. On November 20 van Deventer drove von Lettow southwards into the Kitangari Valley. The Britannic cavalry entered Newala on November 21, and an effort was made to envelop von Lettow's force. The German commander, however, abandoned his artillery and other impedimenta, and escaped to the south, crossing into Portuguese territory, where he was still at large at the end of the year. Colonel Tafel was less fortunate. Moving southwards to join von Lettow, he ran into van Deventer's column near Newala, and was quickly surrounded and compelled to surrender. Between August 1 and November 30 the Britannic forces captured 1,410 Germans (Whites), 4,149 native soldiers, eleven guns and fifty-six machine-guns.

VII. BRITISH EAST AFRICA

The Compulsory Service Act passed by the Nairobi Legislature in the previous year was put into force during the summer, and 200 white men were conscribed. In May a somewhat serious raid occurred in Northern Turkana, but the raiders were defeated and driven off by Captain H. Rayne, who was in command of a patrol of about fifty men of the King's African Rifles.

VIII. LIBERIA.

On May 8 it was announced that the Liberian Republic had broken off diplomatic relations with Germany. The republic was accustomed to look to the United States for guidance, and

it was understood that it was the influence of that country which had induced the Liberian Government to take this step. On June 1, Mr. Daniel E. Howard, the President, issued a proclamation declaring that Liberia would co-operate sympathetically with the United States, France, and Great Britain; and on August 4 a state of war with Germany was formally declared. Austria-Hungary was not included in the declaration. It was announced that German subjects would be deported from the republic

IX. TRIPOLI

In January a somewhat serious revolt took place in Tripoli. Unrest was fomented by Turco-German intrigue, and a certain Souleiman-el-Baruni took the lead among the rebels. An army of 6,000 men was collected in Western Tripoli, and a raid was made upon the loyal natives in the Zouara country. On January 16, however, a strong Italian force under General Latini came into contact with the rebels and completely defeated them. The rebels lost about 500 men killed, and on the following day further casualties were inflicted upon them.

X. MOROCCO

Whilst the condition of the French zone in Morocco was tranquil, considerable unrest existed in the Spanish zone. The celebrated chief Raisuli was largely independent of the Spanish Commissioners, and exercised the authority of a petty sovereign. In May the Spanish Government offered him a high appointment in the Administration, but Raisuli repulsed the offer, evidently preferring to maintain his independent position.

XI. ABYSSINIA.

It will be remembered that the young Emperor, Lidj Jeassu, had been deposed in the autumn of 1916, the Princess Ouizerou Zeoditu, daughter of the late Emperor Menelik, being declared Empress. The great chief, Ras Mikrael, father of Lidj Jeassu, had risen to defend his son, but he had been defeated and captured in October. Lidj Jeassu, however, escaped, and at the beginning of January he fought another battle against the Government forces at Teuteh. He was again defeated, and his army was invested in Magdala. The Empress Zeoditu was crowned in the Cathedral at Addis Abeba on February 11. In August, Lidj Jeassu escaped from Magdala, but on August 26 his force was again routed near Dessie. The ex-Emperor, with a small following, fled to the Dankalis country, where he was still at large at the end of the year.

XII EGYPT.

Egypt, like all the dependencies of the British Crown inhabited by coloured races, was preserved from all the worst effects of the war. As in the earlier years of the war a large number of troops were stationed in the country, but the Egyptians themselves passed through a year of quiet prosperity. On January 1, Sir R. Wingate, the newly appointed High Commissioner for Egypt, took over his post, in succession to Sir Henry McMahon. Sir R. Wingate had previously been Governor-General of the Sudan. Egyptian financial affairs were in a highly satisfactory condition in the year 1916-17, and the year closed with an excellent surplus. The expenditure for that year was £ 17,240,606*l.*, and the revenue was £. 19,927,274*l.* The revenue showed an improvement under nearly all headings. Thus customs receipts increased by £ 875,584*l.*, railway receipts by £. 736,549*l.*, tobacco duties by £. 134,441*l.*, and Mixed Court Fees by £. 133,967. The expenditure was also higher than in the previous year, this being mainly due to the increase in the working expenses of the railways, which was itself occasioned by the high price of coal and other causes.

On October 9 the Sultan of Egypt, Hussein Kamel, died after a prolonged illness. The Sultan, who was the second son of Ismail Pasha, had been placed upon the throne by the British Government in December, 1914 (see *Obituary*). He was succeeded by Prince Ahmed Fuad, the youngest son of Ismail Pasha. The new Sultan was born in 1868, and had been largely educated in Italy.

The decennial census of Egypt was taken on March 6, and rough provisional results were published in May. The population of the country was given as 12,566,000, as compared with 11,143,000 in 1907, this representing an increase of 12.7 per cent. The population of Cairo was 785,000, and that of Alexandria was 435,000. The total given did not include the Bedouins of the desert, who were believed to number about 100,000.

It will be remembered that in previous years military operations had taken place in that portion of Egyptian territory which lies on the Asiatic side of the Suez Canal. For many months the British had remained on the defensive, but towards the end of 1916 they had begun to advance, and in December El Arish had fallen into their hands. In 1917 the British advanced across the frontier, and conquered a large part of Palestine. On January 9 Rafa, situated on the frontier, about 30 miles north-east of El Arish, was captured by mounted troops. These operations were under the supreme direction of General Sir Archibald Murray, whilst General Dobell was in immediate command of the forces now on the frontier. The next operations were not successful. On March 26 the British

delivered an assault upon the Turkish position south of Gaza, but were repulsed with very heavy losses. After this reverse it was thought necessary to relieve both General Murray and General Dobell of their respective commands, and General Allenby was placed in command of the operations. The new Commander made prolonged and thorough preparations for the next offensive, and hence there was little fighting until November. The advance was then rapid. At the beginning of November Beersheba and Gaza were captured, and the occupation of Ascalon and Joppa followed in rapid succession. After these severe defeats the Turks made no very serious attempt to hold Jerusalem, and outmanœuvred by General Allenby's more powerful army, the Moslem host retired from the historic city on December 8. General Allenby attacked the enemy's positions south of the city on the 8th, and it was reported that "Welsh and Home County troops advancing from the direction of Bethlehem drove back the enemy, and passing Jerusalem on the east, established themselves on the Jerusalem-Jericho road." At the same time London troops and Yeomanry attacked on the west and north-west, and established themselves astride the Jerusalem-Shechem road. The report continued. "The Holy City, being thus isolated, was surrendered to Sir Edmund Allenby by the Mayor on December 9." The formal entry took place on the 11th, French and Italian representatives being present. It was reported that the capture had been delayed to some extent owing to the great care which had been taken to avoid damage to sacred places in and round the city. The Berlin report claimed that a final defence in the immediate neighbourhood of the city had been disconcerted for the same reason.

XIII. THE SUDAN.

At the beginning of the year, Sir R. Wingate, the Governor-General, was transferred to Egypt, and his post was taken over by Colonel L. O. F. Stack, C.M.G. There was little news from the territory during the year, and the country was troubled less than usual by native risings. It will be remembered that during 1916 the semi-independent state of Darfur had been conquered by the British, and that it was announced that the state would be incorporated in the Sudan. Darfur was duly organised as a fifteenth province of the Sudan, and Colonel P. J. V. Kelly, who had conquered the Sultanate, was created the first British Governor. In the Budget for 1917 the revenue and expenditure were estimated to balance at £. 1,806,000£., this figure being more than £. 150,000£. above that for 1916.

CHAPTER VIII.

AMERICA.

I. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES.

THE traditional isolation of the United States from the affairs of Europe was abandoned, in a diplomatic sense, before the end of 1916. It will be remembered that on December 20 Dr. Wilson, with all the enhanced prestige and authority which his recent victorious re-election to the Presidency gave him, called upon all the belligerent Powers of Europe to take the preliminary steps towards a conference, and to state definitely the terms on which they would consent to make peace. This action of the Executive was by no means a purely disinterested move. Not only had the United States long been seriously inconvenienced by the economic reactions of the prolonged war, but, as subsequently became apparent, the American Government had good reason to fear, even as early as December, that if peace were not made within a very short time, America herself might find it very difficult any longer to avoid becoming involved in the disastrous conflict. Although the public, both in America and in Europe, were entirely ignorant of the developments of diplomacy in the Wilhelmstrasse, there is no doubt that President Wilson and his advisers were aware that if the Central Powers could not obtain an immediate peace by compromise, the submarine controversy, which had so nearly caused the outbreak of a German-American war in the previous May, would certainly arise again in a still more acute form in 1917. Thus it came about that at the beginning of the year the attention of the Government, and in a lesser degree the thoughts of the people, were concentrated in an unwonted manner upon the external policy of the United States.

On January 22 the President addressed to the Senate a full and elaborate exposition of his opinions upon foreign politics. The President opened his speech with a reference to his identical notes to the belligerents dated December 18, and continued: "The Central Powers united in a reply which stated merely that they were ready to meet their antagonists in conference to discuss terms of peace. The Entente Powers have replied much more definitely, and have stated, in general terms indeed, but with sufficient definiteness to imply details, the arrangements, guarantees, and acts of reparation which they deem to be indispensable conditions of a satisfactory settlement." These replies had, said Dr. Wilson, brought nearer a definite discussion of a peace which should end the war, and therefore, a discussion of future arrangements to prevent the recurrence of such a catastrophe. Since the Senate was the body associated with him in determining American foreign policy, he felt it desirable to disclose to the House his views upon the duty of the United

States in regard to the securing of future peace among the nations. The United States, he said, must obviously play a part in this great work. But the United States would require certain conditions to be fulfilled before entering into a league of nations. The service that they proposed to render to the world was this. "To add their authority and their power to the authority and force of other nations to guarantee peace and justice throughout the world." He would state the American conditions as he conceived them. The present war must, of course, first be ended, but it made "a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it was ended." The terms must create a peace worth guaranteeing. America would have no say in those terms. She would, however, have a voice in determining whether they should be made lasting or not by the guarantee of a universal covenant. No co-operative peace which did not include the New World would be sufficient to keep the future safe against war. "It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no probable combination of nations, could face or withstand it." The question was whether the peace presently to be made would be such as the world would deem worthy of this guarantee. For this purpose it was necessary that there should exist in Europe "not a balance of power, but a community of power, not organised rivalries, but an organised common peace." Fortunately, said Dr. Wilson, explicit assurances had been received on this point. The statesmen of both groups of belligerents had said that they had no desire to crush their opponents. These assurances had important implications. "They imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory." The President then condemned peace by victory. "Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only upon quicksand." Furthermore, "no peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognise and accept the principle that Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from potentate to potentate as if they were property." For instance, there ought to be a "united, independent, and autonomous Poland." Another necessity was that "every great people now struggling towards the full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea," not necessarily by cessions of territory, but perhaps by the neutralisation of direct rights of way. Freedom of the seas should be established, and there should be limitations of naval armaments, and also (though this, said the speaker, was more difficult to arrange)

limitation of military armaments. In laying down these conditions, the President said that he felt that he was expressing the mind of the American people, and he hoped that in effect he was speaking for Liberals of all nations. The policy he proposed was not a contradiction of, but a development of, the traditional foreign policy of the United States. "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world." He proposed that there should be no more entangling alliances. "There is no entangling alliance in a concert of power." In conclusion the speaker said: "These are American principles, American policies. We could stand for no others. And yet they are the principles and policies of forward-looking men and women everywhere, of every modern nation, of every enlightened community. They are the principles of mankind and must prevail."

The ideals set forth by Dr. Wilson in this momentous address were undoubtedly the ideals of nearly all thoughtful Americans. The only serious criticism which was directed against the policies enunciated, came from those who doubted whether the time was ripe for such a move, whether there existed any real likelihood that the nations of the Old World would be able to collaborate in such a league in the near future, and, in consequence, whether America would be wise to contemplate abandoning her traditional isolation.

A few days later the American nation was called upon to face the long-feared crisis in its relations with Germany. On January 31 the German Government sent a note to the United States Government withdrawing the pledge relating to submarine warfare given in May, 1916 (see Germany), and therefore Dr. Wilson severed relations with the Imperial Government. Count Bernstorff, the German Ambassador, being handed his passports on February 3. On the afternoon of that day the President formally announced to a joint sitting of Congress that he had taken this action. The President read most of the important parts of the previous correspondence with the German Government on the submarine issue. The German Government had made its pledge of May 4, 1916, contingent upon the American Government being able "to induce Great Britain also to observe international maritime law," but Dr. Wilson pointed out that he had expressly refused in his note of May 8 to recognise that the German Government had the right to make the promise conditional in this manner¹. In view of the new situation which had arisen, the President had, he said, felt it necessary to take the action which he had threatened to take in such circumstances, namely, to break off all diplomatic relations with the German Empire. He continued to hope that the German Government would not, in actual fact, translate their threats into deeds. But "if this inveterate confidence on

¹ See A.R., 1916, p. 333.

my part in the sobriety and prudent foresight of their purpose should unhappily prove unfounded, if American ships and American lives should in fact be sacrificed by their naval commanders, in heedless contravention of the just and reasonable understandings of international law and the obvious dictates of humanity, I shall take the liberty of coming again before Congress to ask that authority be given to me to use any means that may be necessary for the protection of our seamen and our people in the prosecution of their peaceful, legitimate errands on the high seas." The President said that he took it for granted that other neutral Governments would take the same course, and concluded by repeating that he hoped that the rights of Americans would not in practice be challenged and that peace would therefore be preserved

President Wilson possessed immense influence over his fellow-countrymen, and it was clear that the majority would follow his lead, but there was very little enthusiasm for war in America. Active opposition came from only a very small minority. This minority did not consist of the extreme Democrats only, for a number of Republicans, including Mr Mann, leader of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, also thought that the President was adopting an unduly severe attitude towards the German submarine blockade. An interval of two months elapsed between the severance of relations and the actual declaration of war.

On February 26 Dr. Wilson addressed another joint session of the two Houses, and asked for powers to arm American merchantmen for protective purposes and generally to protect American rights on the high seas. Two American ships had, he said, been sunk by the Germans during February, but on these occasions reasonable care had been taken to preserve life. Nevertheless, the situation was threatening, and the President sought power to adopt a position of "armed neutrality"

Immediately after this sitting the Cunard liner *Laconia* was torpedoed by a German submarine, and among the passengers drowned were several American citizens, including two ladies, Mrs and Miss Hoy. This incident naturally aggravated the tension between the two nations.

On March 1 the Lower House passed by 403 votes to 13 the resolution empowering the President to arm American merchantmen. In the meantime, the American Secret Service revealed a secret plan of the Berlin Foreign Office to embroil the United States with Mexico and Japan, in the event of America declaring war on Germany. The secret proposals appear to have been received with little favour in Mexico, and none in Japan, but the revelation tended to arouse American antipathy towards the German Government, particularly in the West, where maritime outrages were not understood, but where the thorny Mexican problem was well comprehended. A resolution similar to that passed by the Lower House, but some-

what stronger, was introduced into the Senate, but was met by obstructive tactics and did not pass. The existing Congress expired on March 4. Now according to the rules of debate in the Senate no closure was permitted. The resolution authorising armed neutrality undoubtedly and admittedly had the support of a majority of the Senators, but the minority took advantage of the rule permitting unlimited debate to "talk out" the resolution. The minority, numbering twelve only, were led by Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, and also included Senator Stone, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

On March 5 Dr Wilson was duly inaugurated as President for his second term. In his address to Congress he referred to the critical character of the time, described again some of the ideals upon which he had expatiated on January 22, and condemned the action of the Senate minority in obstructing the passage of the armed neutrality resolution.

A few days later the President, after consultation with his legal advisers, announced that he had come to the conclusion that he possessed the legal power to arm merchantmen without recourse to a special authorisation of Congress. Moreover, in order to remove the possibility of obstruction by a small minority of Senators on similar occasions in future, a new rule was passed by the Upper House on March 8, by which a closure of debate could be applied on the motion of a two-thirds majority. The new rule was adopted with only three dissentients, the latter including Mr La Follette. The Government proceeded forthwith to arm American merchant vessels crossing the Atlantic.

On March 21 the President issued a proclamation convening Congress in extra session on April 2, and at the end of March a large number of the Militia regiments were called out for federal service.

In his message to the new Congress on April 2, the President asked for an immediate declaration of war against Germany. The speaker recounted once more the ruthless deeds of the submarines, and declared that "the present German warfare against commerce is warfare against mankind. It is warfare against all nations." Dr Wilson said that he had now come to the conclusion that a policy of armed neutrality was inadequate. America could never submit to these outrages. "With a profound sense of the solemn, even the tragical nature of the step I am taking, and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my Constitutional duty, I advise that Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States, that it formally accept the status of a belligerent which is thus thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps, not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defence, but also

to exert all its power and to employ its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war." This, said the President, would involve close co-operation with the Governments at war with Germany, and the rendering to them of financial assistance. It would also involve "the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war of at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorisation of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training" Dr. Wilson said that his objects were still those which he explained on January 22, February 3, and February 26. The danger to the world consisted in the existence of "autocratic Governments backed by organised force which is controlled wholly by their will and not by the will of their people"—"We have not quarrelled with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering the war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval." Dr. Wilson then said that an autocracy could never be a fit partner in the proposed league of nations, and he referred in a laudatory manner to the Russian Revolution. He complained of the manner in which the German Government had filled the United States with spies since war broke out. "We are now about to accept the gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty, and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world, for the liberation of its peoples—the German peoples included—the rights of nations great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and obedience. The world must be safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon trusted foundations of political liberty." No similar issue had as yet arisen with any of Germany's Allies, because although the Austro-Hungarian Government had avowed its endorsement of Germany's submarine campaign, and it had therefore been impossible to receive Count Tarnowski, the recently accredited Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, Austria-Hungary herself had not actually made war against American citizens. The President said that he was confident that most German-Americans were loyal to the United States. He felt deeply the terrible character of the duty which he was performing. Many months of fiery trial were probably before them. But they were to fight for the things in which they had always believed.

"To such a task we can dedicate our lives, our fortunes, everything we are, everything we have, with the pride of those who know the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and might for the principles that gave her birth, and

the happiness and peace which she has treasured God helping her she can do no other."

The resolution declaring that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany was fully debated by both Houses. It came before the Senate on April 4 and passed down to the House of Representatives on the 5th. The Senate passed the motion on the 4th by 82 votes to 6, Mr. Stone and Mr. La Follette being in the minority. Mr. Stone declared, however, that although he would vote against war, when war had actually broken out, he would support the Administration in the prosecution of it. The Lower House passed the resolution, after a debate lasting seventeen hours, early in the morning of the 6th, the voting being 373 to 50. The debate was very animated, the minority being given a courteous hearing. The minority included Mr. Kitchin, a leading Democrat, and Miss Rankin, the only woman member of the House, but nearly all the prominent politicians in the assembly voted in favour of the resolution. On the same day the President signed the proclamation formally declaring a state of war with Germany.

The preparations for prosecuting the war were conceived on an enormous scale. The first act was the seizure of all the German vessels lying in United States ports, these including some very large liners. There were nearly a hundred vessels in all, and their aggregate tonnage was over 600,000. Immediate steps were taken to recruit the Regular Army up to its maximum strength of 220,000 (its actual strength was under 100,000), and the Militia, the so-called National Guard, up to its legal maximum of 440,000 men. This, however, was only the beginning. A Bill authorising war-credits up to the enormous sum of 1,400,000,000*l.* was passed by Congress in April. From the first, Dr. Wilson was in favour of raising an enormous army for service in Europe by selective conscription. The proposals for conscription met, at the beginning, with considerable opposition in Congress, many members of the House of Representatives wishing to give voluntary service a trial, at least as a preliminary measure. Voluntary recruiting was not very active, however, and it is probable that this was one factor in bringing about the rapid acceptance of the President's plan. The relations of America with the Entente Powers, except perhaps Russia, were most cordial from the outset, and even with Russia relations were good for the first few weeks. Immediately after the declaration of war, messages of congratulation were sent to President Wilson by King George, President Poincaré, and King Victor Emmanuel. Arrangements were made for making large loans to all the Allied Powers, including Russia. Nevertheless, the United States did not herself actually join the Entente. She did not sign the Pact of London, undertaking to make no separate peace, and she entered into no alliance of any kind. She was a friend of the Entente, having, as it was subsequently said, "a common aim," but she

was not an ally. On April 15 Dr. Wilson issued an appeal to all Americans to aid in the great cause, and addressed his solicitations specially to the farmers, explaining that the most urgent duty was to send supplies of food, raw materials, and manufactured goods to the nations fighting against Germany. There were, he said, many things of which those nations were in great need—especially food—which they could not provide for themselves, and which they could only procure in adequate quantities from the United States.

On April 29 both Houses agreed to Dr. Wilson's conscription proposals. The Regular Army was to be raised to 287,000 men by voluntary enlistment, and the Militia to 625,000 men, also by voluntary methods. But the principle of universal obligatory service was also adopted, and it was agreed that selective drafts should be made as required. It was proposed that a first draft of 500,000 men should be embodied at the earliest possible date. The age-limits for compulsory service were fixed at 21 and 30, and it was estimated that there would thus be about 10,000,000 men theoretically available. The registration of men for the purpose of this draft-law was fixed for June 5. At the request of the French Government it was also decided to send a division of Regulars to France immediately, and General John J. Pershing, who had commanded the troops in the Mexican expedition in the previous year, was placed in command of the overseas Expeditionary Force. Increases in the number of the personnel of the Navy and the Marines were also authorised, and squadrons of destroyers were sent to European waters at the end of April, to help hunt the submarines.

At the end of April a British mission, under the leadership of Mr Arthur Balfour, the Foreign Secretary, visited the United States, and conferences took place with the object of organising the co-operation between the two countries. A French mission, including M Viviani and Marshal Joffre, also visited the country. Mr Balfour's conversations with American Cabinet Ministers were reported to have related chiefly to the problem of tightening the blockade of Central Europe. On May 5 Mr Balfour delivered a speech in the House of Representatives, this being the first time that a British subject had ever addressed Congress. The speech, which was a eulogy of democratic institutions, was remarkable for its complete and spontaneous sympathy with the spirit in which America had entered the war. M. Viviani also addressed Congress on a later occasion.

As already stated the national registration of men liable for military service was carried out on June 5. In most parts of the country the enrolment proceeded quietly, and without serious disturbances from anti-conscriptionists. It was announced on June 22 that 9,650,000 men had been registered. On July 15 the Militia were called into the Federal service, under

special powers granted to the President by Congress. This act made the Militia liable for overseas service. The first draft of conscripts numbered 687,000 men, and these recruits were called up for service all over the country during September and October. It was stated that the embodiment of this first draft brought up the armed strength of the United States, naval and military, to the total of 1,750,000.

Two war loans were issued during the year, the first in June and the second in October. These were known as the First and Second Liberty Loans respectively. The first loan was to bear interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and on this occasion 400,000,000*l.* was asked for by the Government. This loan was oversubscribed by more than 200,000,000*l.* This represented the first instalment of the 1,400,000,000*l.* credit authorised by Congress. On the second occasion 600,000,000*l.* was asked for, the loan bearing interest at 4 per cent. This was oversubscribed by 323,506,460*l.*, and this sum—923,506,460*l.*—was up to date much the greatest response ever made to a demand for credit of any Government of any country. Only 50 per cent. of the oversubscription was accepted by the Government, however.

The American Government realised from the outset that the first necessity for an efficient prosecution of the war by the United States, or, indeed, by the Entente, was an increase in the number of ships available. Upon the maintenance of the mercantile marine everything ultimately depended. The plans for shipbuilding were consequently conceived on the largest scale. It was stated in September that the existing tonnage of the American mercantile marine, including the German and Austro-Hungarian vessels which had been seized, was only 3,500,000, but that if the plans made by the Administration were duly carried out, the United States would possess before the end of 1918 about 1,600 ships with an aggregate tonnage of 9,200,000.¹ A large number of ships were to be purchased, but over 3,000,000 tons were to be built in twelve months.

The plans for aerial warfare were also conceived on a large scale. In July Congress passed a vote of 128,000,000*l.* to be expended on the Air Service. It was significant that the House of Representatives voted the money without asking for any details of the plans of the War Department, and without any knowledge of the number of aeroplanes and airmen to be sent to Europe.

Congress was in session throughout the summer, and did not adjourn until the beginning of October. In September another War Credits Bill was passed, which provided the Government with the sum of 2,300,000,000*l.* This did not represent exclusively "new money," however, since 600,000,000*l.* was included for the purpose of converting the First Liberty Loan from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 4 per cent. and another 107,000,000*l.*

¹ The estimate made no allowance for sinkings by hostile submarines.

for the conversion of certain other loans. New taxes were imposed which were expected to produce about 500,000,000*l* per annum. Congress authorised loans to the Entente up to the total of 1,400,000,000*l*., and of this 717,000,000*l* had been actually lent up to November. Sums aggregating 372,000,000*l*. were advanced to Great Britain up to November

The American Government, like the other belligerent Governments, received the Pope's peace note in August, and on August 30 the American reply was issued. The note stated that the mere cessation of hostilities ought not to be sought unless such cessation could be obtained on conditions which would ensure a stable and enduring peace. "The object of this war is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible Government which, having secretly planned to dominate the world, proceeded to carry the plan out without regard either to the sacred obligations of treaty or the long-established practices and long-cherished principles of international action and honour; which chose its own time for the war, delivered its blow fiercely and suddenly; stopped at no barrier either of law or of mercy; swept a whole continent within the tide of blood, not the blood of soldiers only, but the blood of women and children also, and of the helpless poor; and now stands balked but not defeated, the enemy of four-fifths of the world." This evil power was, continued the note, not the German people, but the ruthless master of the German people. To make peace with this power in the way proposed by the Pope would perpetuate the menace "We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to endure, unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidence of the will and purpose of the German peoples themselves as the other peoples of the world would be justified in accepting." The note was signed by Mr. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State.

The American Government's attitude towards the proposed Stockholm Peace Conference of Socialists was identical with that of the British, French, and Italian Governments, and Mr. Lansing refused to issue passports to the proposed American Socialist delegates.

Congress reassembled on December 3, and on the following day the President delivered an Address. The speaker said that the American people were united, and were impatient with those who desired peace by any sort of compromise. They held "that this intolerable thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force, which we now see so clearly as the German power, a thing without conscience or honour or capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed, and if it be not utterly brought to an end, at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations." The Prussian power had been established over the

lands and peoples of Germany's Allies. That grip must be loosened. "We owe it, however, to ourselves to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire." Similarly, no one was threatening the independence or peaceful enterprise of the German Empire, but it was hoped that the German people would take their fate into their own hands, and free themselves from the control of their present masters. In the prosecution of the war every obstacle which stood in the way must be swept away. An embarrassing obstacle was that America was at war with Germany but not with Germany's Allies. The President therefore recommended Congress to declare war against Austria-Hungary. This might seem inconsistent with his previous remarks; but in reality was not so. "Austria-Hungary is for the time being not her own mistress, but simply the vassal of the German Government. The Government of Austria-Hungary is not acting upon its own initiative, or in response to the wishes and feelings of its own peoples, but as the instrument of another nation." He did not advise a declaration of war against Turkey and Bulgaria at present. The speech ended with a peroration on the lofty purposes of America.

Both Houses of Congress passed the resolution declaring war on Austria-Hungary on December 7. The Senate was unanimous, seventy-four Senators voting. The motion was passed in the Lower House by 363 votes to 1.

II. CANADA.

During the year under consideration events in Canada were of peculiar interest, not only on account of the important part which this Dominion was playing in the war, but also because of the significance possessed by the great political contest which took place. The political controversies, though they were primarily the domestic concern of Canada, could not fail to have considerable influence upon the course of politics in the other three Oversea Dominions of the British Crown and even in Great Britain. The outbreak and long continuance of a state of war had brought all the five white nations of the British Empire face to face with the same problems. And these problems were, of course, quite unlike those which had attracted most attention in peace. Among these new problems, one of the most important, possibly the most important, was the question of establishing compulsory military service for oversea campaigns. By the end of 1917 this question had arisen in an acute form in four of the five nations. And the importance and interest of the controversies which were aroused, or, to be more accurate, of the single controversy occurring in the several regions of the Empire, lay in the fact that fundamental ethical issues respecting the right of the state over the individual were involved, and that, at the same time, the question

of military recruiting was one of considerable urgency. The question of conscription for Imperial and foreign service was, it must be remembered, entirely distinct from that of obligatory service for home defence. The two problems were distinct historically, they were distinct in practical politics, and they were held by those who supported the one project and opposed the other to be distinct ethically. Conscript armies for purposes of home defence existed in Australia and in New Zealand, and universal liability to serve in the Militia in time of peril to the home country was the law in South Africa. In Great Britain a vague but real and time-honoured obligation to defend the shores rested upon every man, and a similar but more definite obligation existed in Canada. The duty of every man to defend his own hearth and home had been implicit in all the traditions of Englishry from the time of Alfred the Great, and even earlier. But conscription for service in foreign expeditions did not exist in any British community before the war, and, indeed, the idea was never even mooted.

In the stress of war, however, public opinion on these questions underwent a rapid change. Great Britain was fighting, if not for her existence as a state, at least for her position as a Great Power, and the British in the Home Islands and in the outer marches forgot all other considerations. The traditions of individual liberty, so far as anybody even thought of them, were held to be subordinate to the needs of the time. Conscription for foreign service was adopted with but little dissidence in Great Britain and New Zealand, and in Australia the proposal was submitted to a poll of the people in 1916 and was defeated by only a small majority. In the great North American Dominion the overseas armies were maintained at a high level by voluntary enlistment up to the end of 1916, but the stream then began to dry up, and the country found itself confronting the question which had already been answered elsewhere.

The development of the issue was such as might have been anticipated by anyone familiar with Canadian politics. A programme for conscription was adopted by the Conservative Party, led by Sir Robert Borden, the Federal Prime Minister, and the Liberal Party was rent in twain by the issue.

At first sight it appeared to the onlooker that seeing that conscription had been defeated in Australia, a country whose people were almost exclusively British in blood, the proposal would have little or no chance of being accepted in Canada, a large proportion of whose population was not of British extraction. The Dominion's population was under eight millions, and of this total over two millions were French, six hundred thousand were German and Austrian settlers, and thousands of the remainder belonged to other foreign nationalities. It was clear that unless the British Canadians were virtually unanimous in favour of compulsory service, Sir Robert

Borden's project would not command a majority in the country. The great majority of the recently arrived settlers of foreign nationality might be good Canadians. And it must be said of the German colonists that very many of them undoubtedly were good Canadians. But the alien settlers could hardly be expected to be good British Imperialists. The French constituted a distinct problem; but they were admittedly hostile. And, as will be seen, the conscriptionists, perceiving the necessity for prompt action, hoped that they might be able to carry the measure through Parliament without any appeal to the electorate. The Bill was passed by the legislature, but owing to the strong opposition of the French, the Government found themselves obliged to appeal to the country, and their tactics, which were criticised as undemocratic, had the effect of embittering an already hot controversy.

The chance of the policy of conscription obtaining a majority in the country was not, however, so remote as appeared at first sight, from the crude inference from the Australian experience. If the presence of a large foreign population was a handicap, there were other factors which were favourable. In Australia there existed an enormously powerful Socialist Party. In Canada the Socialists were negligibly few. And the experience of Great Britain and New Zealand showed how easily conscription was accepted, in the circumstances then existing, where Socialism was weak. The British community in Canada was, in this connection, comparable, not to Australia, but to Great Britain and New Zealand, and might well be equally overwhelmingly in favour of obligatory service. Moreover, Canada was influenced by the example of the United States, which had adopted the policy of compulsory drafts immediately after entering the war. Furthermore, the position of the Entente Powers was less satisfactory in the autumn of 1917 than it had been in the autumn of 1916 when the Australian referendum was taken, and the call for recruits therefore made a stronger appeal. And, finally, the Government, as will be seen, passed a suffrage Bill which had the effect of handicapping the voluntarists.

Parliament was opened by the new Governor-General, the Duke of Devonshire, on January 19. The sitting took place in the Victoria Museum, the Parliament House having been burnt down in the previous year. The Speech from the Throne dealt almost exclusively with Canada's part in the war. The Duke said that he felt it a privilege to be associated with Canada whilst she was doing so much for the Empire. Up to date nearly 400,000 Canadians had enlisted. Canada was being invited to the councils of the Empire; and Canadian statesmen were to take part in the forthcoming War Conference in London. Canada, like all the other Dominions, was determined to prosecute the war till an abiding peace had been obtained.

The Governor-General's sentiments were echoed by both Sir

Robert Borden, the Conservative Premier, and by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal Leader of the Opposition. The latter issued a manifesto at the end of January urging his followers to avoid all partisanship, and to concentrate their energies upon work necessary to the prosecution of the war. He also appealed to young and healthy men to enlist

In February Parliament was adjourned after urgent business had been transacted in order to allow the Canadian representatives to depart for the Special War Conference in London. The Canadian delegates were Sir R. Borden, Mr. Robert Rogers (Minister of Public Works), and Mr. J. D. Hazen (Minister of Marine).

A long statement on Canada's financial position was made in Parliament by Sir W. T. White, Minister of Finance, on April 24. The federal revenue for the past fiscal year had amounted to 46,400,000*l.*, an increase of over 20,000,000*l.* since the outbreak of the war. During the year the country had paid out of revenue all its current and capital expenditure, and all interest on the now inflated national debt. In addition the revenue had sufficed to provide 12,000,000*l.* towards the principal of the country's war expenditure. A third domestic War Loan had been issued in March, in the shape of 5 per cent. bonds at the price of 96. The sum of 30,000,000*l.* had been asked for, but no less than 53,000,000*l.* had been subscribed.

At the beginning of April, fairly complete statistics relating to enlistments in the Canadian Army were issued. Up to that time 407,000 men had enlisted, and over 300,000 men had crossed to Europe. In the province of Ontario 170,000 men had volunteered. In Quebec 44,000 had enlisted. The total casualties incurred amounted to about 75,000.

In May, M. Viviani, head of the French mission to America, visited Canada, and on May 12 he addressed the two Houses of Parliament in joint session. He was formally welcomed to Canada by Sir George Foster (who was then acting as Premier in Sir R. Borden's absence) and by Sir W. Laurier. Subsequently Mr. A. J. Balfour, British Foreign Secretary, visited Canada, and addressed Parliament on May 29.

At the end of May, after the Premier's return from England, it was announced that the Government had decided to introduce the principle of compulsory enlistment, in the form of compulsory drafts. This announcement caused a tremendous sensation in the country. Intense hostility was aroused in Quebec, and it was soon evident that the Bill would be opposed by all French Liberals, and also that most, if not all, French Conservatives would desert the Ministry on this issue. The Labour Unions met at the beginning of June and expressed opposition to the proposal. On the other hand, the Premier's announcement caused a feeling of relief among English-speaking Conservatives, who had been troubled about the slow progress of recruiting in recent months, and the project was accepted.

almost as readily by many English-speaking Liberals, especially in the Western provinces. It was evident that the course of events would depend largely upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier's attitude. After the conscription proposals had been announced, the Premier asked Sir W. Laurier to form a Coalition Cabinet in order to carry through the measure. He proposed that apart from the Prime Minister, the Conservatives and Liberals should have an equal number of seats in the Ministry. Sir Wilfrid Laurier refused this offer, and explained that he thought that the Conscription Bill should not be introduced into the House until the project had been submitted to the test of a referendum and had been approved. The Premier made the counter-suggestion that the Bill should be introduced and passed, but should not be actually put into force until after a general election had been held, but this did not satisfy the leader of the Opposition.

The Bill was introduced into the House of Commons on June 11. Sir R. Borden said that volunteering had at first been wonderfully vigorous, but that latterly it had slackened greatly, and that if the Canadian divisions in the field were to be reinforced, or even maintained at full strength, conscription was unavoidable. He had given a pledge to the men at the front, and he meant that that pledge should be kept. There was, he said, really no new principle in the Bill, since the Militia Act embodied the principle of obligatory service.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in criticising the introduction of the Bill, said that it was a violation of the principles of democracy to introduce such a revolutionary measure without an appeal to the electorate. The Bill provided for the calling up of 100,000 men in ten classes, the age-limits for service being twenty and forty-five. Tribunals were to be established to adjudicate upon individual claims for exemption, and certain classes, such as the clergy and the Doukhobars (who had entered Canada with a definite promise that they would not be expected to perform military service) were excepted from the provisions of the Bill.

On June 18, Sir Robert Borden moved the second reading of the Bill. The Premier made only a short speech, but he again asserted that there was no new principle in the Bill, because obligatory service had been the law in Canada, at least in theory, since the statute of 1868 was passed. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved an amendment, proposing that the measure should be submitted to a referendum, and made a long speech. The Bill ought never to have been introduced, he said, without an appeal to the people, more particularly as this Parliament was now "moribund," forty-eight seats in Parliament being vacant. It was incorrect to say that the Bill did not introduce a new principle, because the Militia Act gave the Government no authority whatever to send forces outside Canada. "French Canadians have not enlisted as they should have done, and no

one regrets this more than I do; but in British countries there is only one way, and that is an appeal to the country." Sir W. Laurier suggested that, as was only natural, volunteering had proceeded inversely as the length of time that the families concerned had been in the country. The percentage had been highest among the British-born, appreciably lower among English-speaking Canadian-born, and lowest among the French, whose associations with Europe had ceased long ago. The Government were, he declared, causing a most regrettable cleavage between the two races. The next day, Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, replied to the Liberal Leader. He quoted the example of the United States and condemned the attitude of the Opposition which, he said, meant that Sir Wilfrid Laurier would not let the Militia stir hand or foot until the "Huns," victorious in Europe, landed in Canada. Mr. Pardee, the Chief Liberal Whip, also opposed the proposal for a referendum, on the ground that, in his opinion, conscription would probably be defeated at the poll. Mr. W. C. Weichel, the only German member of the House, announced that he would vote for the Bill—an illustration of the extraordinary paradox that the German population in Canada were positively less out of sympathy with the war-policy than were the French.

The debate on the second reading closed on the night of July 5-6. Sir W. Laurier's amendment was defeated by 111 votes to 62, and the second reading was then carried by 118 votes to 55. The majority included twenty-five English-speaking Liberals and one French Liberal. The minority included twelve French Conservatives and twelve English-speaking Liberals. The third reading in the House of Commons was passed on July 24, and in August the Bill was duly passed by the Senate.

On July 1, which was the Jubilee of the Dominion (the British North American Act having been proclaimed on July 1, 1867), the Prime Minister sent a message to the Canadian people, in which he referred to the wonderful progress of the country during the past fifty years, and urged the people to bear their full part in the war.

It will be remembered that in the previous year the Government, by agreement with the Opposition, had prolonged the life of Parliament by one year. Sir Robert Borden desired to extend the life of the legislature again by one year, but in the altered circumstances this was opposed by the Liberals. The Government's resolution on the subject passed the Lower House by only a small majority, and the Premier therefore decided that it would not be legitimate to proceed further with the project. Thus a federal general election became necessary at the end of the year.

During August a convention of the Liberals of the four Western provinces was held at Winnipeg. All the four pro-

vinces had Liberal Governments at this time, and the four Premiers, Mr Norris of Manitoba, Mr. Martin of Saskatchewan, Mr A. L. Sifton of Alberta, and Mr. Brewster of British Columbia, were present. A resolution expressing confidence in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's leadership was passed, but the speeches struck a somewhat uncertain note, and it was very evident that most of the speakers were very anxious not to appear lukewarm on the question of the war.

In September a War Franchise Bill was introduced by the Ministry and duly passed. The most important provision of the Bill was the enfranchisement of certain classes of women. Thus the vote was given to all the nearer female relatives of men serving in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The wives, widows, mothers, daughters, and even sisters of the soldiers were enfranchised. This provision was defended by the Ministerialists on the ground that it was just to give the vote to relations of the men who "had done their duty" towards Canada and the Empire. On the other side, it was criticised as a gross piece of political jerrymandering, the Government having deliberately selected, so it was alleged, those classes of women who were likely to be favourable to the policy of conscription. The Opposition contended that it was unjust to penalise Canadian citizens merely because they happened to differ from the Government on the question of the desirability of maintaining a great Canadian Army in Europe. It was stated that no fewer than half a million women were enfranchised by this clause. It is certain, therefore—whether or not the measure was justifiable—that it had a very material effect upon the results of the elections. There were other and less controversial provisions in the Bill. All members of the Expeditionary Force, including nurses, Red Indians, and Hindus, were enfranchised. "Conscientious objectors" to military service were disfranchised, as also natives of hostile countries who had lived in Canada less than fifteen years. This clause excluded from the vote most of the German and Austro-Hungarian settlers on the prairies, but the German communities in the East, which had been established much longer, and many of whose members were strikingly loyal to Canada, were but little affected by the provision.

Parliament was prorogued on September 20 and dissolved on October 6.

In October, after prolonged negotiations, Sir Robert Borden succeeded in inducing some of the most prominent of the English-speaking Liberals to agree to form a Coalition Ministry. Many Liberals, especially those of the Western provinces, were no less strongly in favour of conscription than were the Conservatives, and they decided that they ought to give active support to this project, rather than to adhere rigidly to their party-loyalty to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The new Cabinet included the following statesmen:—

Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs—Sir Robert Borden.
President of the Privy Council—Mr N. W. Rowell
Minister of Finance—Sir W. T. White.
Minister of Militia—General Mewburn
Minister for Oversea Forces—Sir A. E. Kamp.
Minister of Communications—Mr J. D. Reid
Solicitor-General—Mr H. Guthrie
Minister of Justice—Mr C. H. Dohearty.
Minister of the Interior—Mr A. Meighen.
Minister of Customs—Mr A. L. Sifton
Minister of Trade and Commerce—Sir G. R. Foster
Minister of Agriculture—Mr C. A. Crerar.
Minister of Colonisation and Immigration—Mr J. A. Calder.
Secretary of State—Mr M. Burrell
Postmaster-General—Mr P. E. Blondin.
Minister of Inland Revenue—Mr A. Sevigny.
Minister of Public Works—Mr F. B. Carvell
Minister of Marine and Fisheries—Colonel Ballantyne.
Ministers without Portfolio—Mr F. Cochrane and Sir J. A. Lougheed

The Liberal Party was thus represented in the new Cabinet by Mr. Rowell, General Mewburn, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. A. L. Sifton (Premier of Alberta), Mr. C. A. Crerar, Mr. Calder, Mr. Carvell, and Colonel Ballantyne. Mr. Crerar was Chairman of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, and Mr. Rowell was Leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature.

The Coalition Government commenced at once to put the Conscription Act into force, and men were enrolled in accordance with the scheme of drafts. Local tribunals were instituted for the purpose of considering claims for exemption, and it was stated that in Quebec the tribunals granted claims for exemption in very large numbers.

In November another Dominion War-Loan was issued. The amount of the loan was 30,000,000*l.*, and the bonds, bearing 5*½* per cent. interest, were issued at par. The loan was a great success, about 82,000,000*l.* being subscribed. There were over 700,000 subscribers.

The election campaign was fought with great vigour and considerable bitterness. The less responsible Conservatives attacked the anti-Conscriptionists as "traitors," and many of the Nationalists condemned the war-policy in violent terms, and even expressed hostility to the British connection. The contest also bore the character of a sectarian struggle to a degree quite unfamiliar to Englishmen. Although the Roman Church did not take sides officially, in that there was no actual interference from the Vatican, it was nevertheless notorious that great numbers of the Catholic clergy were working for the Liberal candidates. On the other side, the Presbyterians of Ontario were active, and the Anglican Church, through Dr. Matheson, Primate of all Canada, declared in favour of the Conscriptionists, and asked for prayers in all Anglican churches for the success of the Government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself was, however, consistently moderate. He emphasised that "the supreme object was to assist in the tremendous struggle" in which Canada was involved, and that internal discords ought

to be avoided. He declared that if returned to power, he would submit the proposal for conscription to a referendum, on a just franchise, and then carry out the wishes of the majority. It is thus necessary to distinguish between the attitude of the venerable Liberal Leader and that of the Quebec Nationalists, who were led by Mr. Bourassa.

Nominations were fixed for November 19 and the elections took place on December 17. The polling among the troops in Europe began, however, on December 1, and lasted four weeks. The Liberal Governments of the four Western provinces supported the Federal Government, but in Ontario Sir W. Laurier retained control of the party "machine." The Liberals and the Nationalists co-operated in Quebec, and the weak little Labour Party also opposed conscription. There were only nineteen unopposed returns.

The elections resulted in a great victory for Sir Robert Borden. Apart from the Army votes, the Conscriptionists, or "Unionists" as they now styled themselves, won 137 seats, as against 93 seats won by the Opposition. The Unionists swept the Western provinces, and won a large majority of the Ontario constituencies. On the other hand, of the 65 seats in Quebec, the Liberals won 62, and they likewise won all the four seats in Prince Edward Island and a majority of the Nova Scotian constituencies. The majorities on both sides were in most cases very large. There was thus a high segregation of political opinion. Every seat in the Toronto district was carried by the Unionists. Sir G. Foster won Toronto North by 15,000 and Major Andrews carried Winnipeg Central by 13,000. Sir W. Laurier held Quebec East by 6,000 and Mr. J. E. Le Sage won Hochelaga by 9,000. Mr. Sevigny and Mr. Blondin, the two French Conservative Cabinet Ministers, were both defeated. The elections had to be postponed in four Halifax constituencies owing to the disaster mentioned below. Although feeling was high, the polling passed off without much unseemly hooliganism.

An appalling disaster occurred at Halifax on December 6. A munition ship, carrying most powerful high explosives, blew up outside the harbour, and so great was the force of the explosion that a large part of the city was laid in ruins, and fires broke out in all directions. It was reported that 10,000 persons had lost their lives, and many thousands more were injured or rendered homeless.

A series of provincial general elections took place during the year. In New Brunswick an election was held in February, and the Conservative Government were defeated. The Liberals returned with a majority of six, and Mr. W. E. Foster formed a Ministry. In Saskatchewan elections were held on June 26, and Mr. Martin's Liberal Ministry were returned with a large majority. Similarly, in Alberta, where elections were also held in June, Mr. Sifton's Liberal Government were returned with 38 seats out of 56. Women voted for the first time in these

two prairie elections, and in Alberta a woman-candidate (Mrs. McKenney) was elected to the legislature. The Ontario Parliament passed a Woman Suffrage Act in the spring, and a similar Act was passed in Nova Scotia. A proposal of the Liberal Opposition in Ontario to give women the right of election to the legislature was defeated. It should be observed, that the provincial Parliaments, in adopting female suffrage, gave the vote to women generally, without regard to whether their male relations were or were not in the Canadian Army.

At the end of the year the sharp schism between the French and English-speaking populations was causing considerable anxiety, and a motion was foreshadowed in the Quebec Parliament advocating the withdrawal of Quebec from the Confederation.

III NEWFOUNDLAND.

In the Atlantic Colony the political life of the people was less perturbed by the war than had been the case in the greater self-governing Dominions. In this country the vexed question of compulsory military service was not raised as a matter of practical politics. The possibility of entering the Canadian Federation remained the most important problem of external affairs which confronted the Newfoundland electors. The subject was again discussed in governing circles. On June 14 the question was raised in the Federal House of Commons at Ottawa, and Mr Lemieux spoke in favour of the proposal, and declared that according to the information which he received, feeling in the island was becoming more inclined towards the idea of union with the remainder of British North America.

The country being somewhat isolated from the great centres of civilisation, it is perhaps not surprising that the interest taken in the war was hardly as keen as elsewhere. Over ten thousand men volunteered, however, for service in the naval and military forces of the Crown. It is true that this number is not large, even in proportion to the small population of the country, but it must be remembered that many of the islanders were engaged in fishing and sealing, and were needed in these important industries.

In July a Coalition Ministry was formed. The Conservative Premier, Sir E. P. Morris, agreed to reconstruct the Cabinet with six Conservative and six Liberal members. Negotiations with this object had been proceeding for some time, and Mr. W. Lloyd, Leader of the Opposition, accepted the portfolio of Justice. A Bill was passed extending for twelve months the life of the Parliament, which would have expired in October.

In October it was announced that Mr. Charles Alexander Harris, of the Colonial Office, had been appointed Governor of Newfoundland, in succession to Sir W. E. Davidson, who had been appointed Governor of New South Wales. Mr. Harris

was promoted to be a Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George.

At the end of September the 420th anniversary of the discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot was celebrated in London, the functions being extended over nearly a week.

At the end of the year a Cabinet crisis arose. A general election was expected in 1918, and the Premier, thinking that his retirement would obviate the sharp political conflict which might otherwise occur, and which he thought undesirable during the war, decided to resign. At the beginning of January, 1918, it was announced that Sir E. P. Morris had resigned, and that the Governor had called upon Mr. W. Lloyd to form a Ministry.

Sir E. P. Morris was born in 1858. He had represented St John's continuously since 1885, and had been Prime Minister for nine years. He represented his colony at the War Conference of the Empire in London in the spring, and after his resignation the British Government announced that a barony of the United Kingdom had been conferred upon him.

IV GREENLAND.

By the terms of the Danish-American agreement transferring the Danish West Indies to the United States, the American Government formally recognised Danish sovereignty over the whole of Greenland.

V MEXICO.

At the beginning of 1917 affairs in Mexico were less unsatisfactory than they had been for several years. General Carranza, who had been *de facto* President of the Republic since the end of 1915, had succeeded in extending the power of his Government over a large part of the country, although anarchy still reigned in some of the Western districts. The chief obstacle to an effective pacification of the country as a whole was the presence of General Villa, a blood-stained bandit who had once been General Carranza's rival for the leadership of the so-called Constitutional Party. This ruffian roamed about the wilder North-western districts of Mexico with a small army of followers. During 1916 some of Villa's bandits had committed outrages on American territory, and, with the consent of Carranza, a small American force, under the command of General Pershing, had been sent across the border in pursuit of the outlaws. Owing to the hostile attitude of the general population of the country, however, the Americans were unable to carry through their operations vigorously, and the bandit-chief was not captured. Indeed, the presence of American troops in Mexico led to serious complications, and but for the extreme anxiety of both Governments to avoid hostilities, war between the two countries would almost certainly have ensued. An agreement was reached, however, and in January the Washington Government ordered

the withdrawal of the American troops from Mexico. At the beginning of March an election was held, and Carranza was duly elected President of the Republic. In view of the state of the country, the polling of the electors must have been far from complete, but the Constitutional authority thus bestowed upon Carranza was as good as could be expected in the circumstances.

In the diplomatic situation which arose out of the initiation of the German submarine campaign in February, the Mexican Government took a line of action quite unlike that of the other Latin-American Republics, and indeed, unlike that of any other neutral state. In his reply to the German announcement, General Carranza entered no protest, and indicated that he deemed the action of Germany justified in the circumstances. The Mexican Government were undoubtedly Germanophil. The bare fact that the Germans had fallen out with the United States was quite sufficient to win them favour among the Mexicans.

On April 16 a new Congress assembled, this being the first Mexican Congress to be opened since the legislature was forcibly dissolved by General Huerta in 1913. President Carranza read a statement describing his work during his period of office, and taking credit for the avoidance of war with the United States. On the following day the Ambassador to the United States, Senor Ignacio Bonillas, presented his credentials at Washington.

At the beginning of June the President formed a new Cabinet which included the following statesmen —

Minister for Foreign Affairs—Senor C. Perez.
Minister of the Interior—Senor A. Berlanga.
Minister of Finance—Senor Nieto.
Minister of Industry and Commerce—Senor A. Pau.
Minister of Public Works—Senor N. Ruiz.
Minister of War—Senor A. Cartro.
Minister of Communications—Senor R. Gutierrez.

Up to the end of the year General Villa's bands were still at large in Chihuahua and Oaxaca, and in November serious conflicts took place in and around Ojinaga (Chihuahua) between the Villistas and Mexican Government troops.

At the end of the year negotiations were taking place for the issuing of an American loan to Mexico.

VI. BRAZIL

The events of 1917 enhanced the influence and prestige of the Brazilian Republic. Up to February, 1917, every independent country in the Western Hemisphere had remained neutral in the European War, but the German Government's announcement of unrestricted submarine warfare against merchant shipping quite altered the political situation in the world at large, as distinct from the situation in Europe. The United States entered the war against Germany, and the influence of the North American Republic in South America was of course great. Nevertheless, a certain jealousy of the United States

existed among the Southern Republics, and the fact that President Wilson soon found his anti-German policy supported by most of the smaller nations, was due in no small measure to the strong lead given by Brazil, the greatest of the Latin-American Republics. The Central Powers thus found themselves at war with a whole group of new enemies—with countries of Asia and Africa as well as countries of the two Americas. None of these new belligerents became allied to the Entente, they formed a separate group diplomatically, but they were, of course, co-operating towards the same end, the reduction of the Central Empires of Europe.

Immediately after the fateful German announcement was made, the President, Dr. Wenceslao Braz, called a Cabinet Council to consider the questions which had arisen, and the Brazilian Government also communicated with the various other Governments of Latin-America. Early in February the Cabinet despatched a strongly worded protest to Berlin, declaring that the extension of the blockade in the manner proposed was contrary to International Law, and that Brazil would hold Germany responsible for any consequences which might ensue to Brazilian shipping. This first Brazilian note added, however, that the Republic was anxious to continue to maintain neutrality in the war. It soon became clear, however, that the Brazilian Government's expressed anxiety to remain neutral did not imply any weakness in upholding the country's maritime rights.

On April 4 the Brazilian steamer *Parana* was sunk by a German submarine off the coast of France, several of the crew being drowned. The Brazilian Government waited for several days in order to obtain an accurate report of the incident, and then, on April 10, the Cabinet broke off diplomatic relations with Germany. The Dutch Minister took over the care of German interests in Brazil, and Switzerland took charge of Brazilian interests in Germany. The rupture of relations did not involve an immediate departure from neutrality; indeed, on the contrary, on April 28 the Government issued a proclamation of neutrality in the war between the United States and Germany. In the crisis which had thus arisen, Dr. Lamo Muller, the Foreign Minister, felt it advisable to resign; the statesman seems to have thought that his German name and antecedents precluded him from continuing to hold the portfolio of Foreign Affairs with advantage to the country. On May 2, it was announced that Senor Nilo Pecanha had been appointed Foreign Minister. Senor Pecanha had formerly been Federal President, and was at this time President of the State of Rio de Janeiro.

Brazilian neutrality was not of long duration. At the end of May, President Braz sent a message to Congress advising that the neutrality decree of April 28 be revoked. The message stated that unity of action with the United States was a tradition

tion of Brazilian foreign policy. On May 29 the Chamber passed unanimously the Bill authorising the revocation of Brazilian neutrality. The same Bill authorised the seizure and utilisation of the German ships in Brazilian ports. The aggregate tonnage of these vessels was nearly 250,000. At the beginning of June the Senate duly passed this Bill, but a state of war was not formally declared until the end of October, after another Brazilian steamer, the *Macao*, had been sunk.

VII ARGENTINA

The attitude of the Argentine Government towards the submarine crisis was not identical with that of Brazil. It was a tradition of the Argentine Foreign Office to take a somewhat different course from that pursued by Brazil, and this occasion was no exception to the general rule. On February 7 the Argentine Government issued a note in reply to the German announcement of unrestricted submarine warfare. The note merely stated that the Government regretted that the Emperor had considered it necessary to adopt such extreme measures, and added that the Government would, as heretofore, "base its conduct on the fundamental principles and rules of International law." The note was thus much less condemnatory in tone than the protests of most of the American Republics, and indeed, even than those of the European neutrals, which were notoriously more inclined to be Germanophil than were the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

After the rupture of relations between Washington and Berlin, Senor Irigoyen, the Argentine President, made a proposal to the other Latin-American Republics, that they, all the nations of Latin-America, should make a joint offer to mediate between the United States and Germany. Most of the other Republics, and notably Brazil, promptly rejected this Argentine proposal, and the suggestion received no very active support from any quarter except Mexico. The Mexican President was, indeed, quite willing to adopt this plan of action, and he even seems to have contemplated the idea of forbidding the export of food and the raw materials for munitions from Mexico. These Argentine and Mexican schemes failed to develop, however, and opinion all over Latin-America was predominantly with Brazil, and therefore with the United States, and not with the neutralist attitude of Mexico and Argentina.

Later in the year the people of Argentina were brought face to face with one of the worst examples of German militarism. In September the United States Government published certain information which the American Secret Service had gathered in regard to proceedings at the German Legation at Buenos Aires. It appeared that Count Luxburg, the German Chargé d'Affaires at Buenos Aires, had been sending messages to Berlin via the Swedish Legation at Buenos Aires and the Stockholm Foreign Office. The American Government held that this was

an unneutral act upon the part of Sweden. It was, however, the content of the messages which aroused the greatest storm. Serious friction between Germany and Argentina was caused in April by the sinking of a small Argentine vessel by a German submarine. On that occasion the German Government apologised. Count Luxburg, however, in order to avoid similar diplomatic difficulties in future, advised his Government either not to sink Argentine vessels at all, or "to sink them without leaving any trace" (*spurlos versenkt*). This cynical advice, which was given in two of the messages intercepted by the American Secret Service, naturally amazed and enraged the Argentine public, and an ultimatum demanding a complete disavowal of Count Luxburg was dispatched to Berlin. The Argentine Government also immediately dismissed Count Luxburg. Both Houses of Parliament passed resolutions demanding the severance of relations with Germany. The affair was settled, however, by a prompt and complete apology on the part of the German Government. The apology read as follows —

"The Imperial Government keenly regrets what has happened, and absolutely disapproves of the ideas expressed by Count Luxburg on the method of carrying out submarine warfare. These ideas are personal to him. They have not had and will not have any influence on the decisions and promises of the Empire."

It was reported that many members of the legislature remained favourable to a rupture of relations, but President Irigoyen deemed the apology sufficient. No further serious international incidents arose during the remainder of the year.

Early in the year the immigration statistics for 1914 and 1915 were published. There were 115,321 immigrants in 1914, and only 45,290 in 1915, the reduction being caused, of course, by the war.

During the autumn there was very serious Labour unrest in many parts of the Republic.

VIII. CHILI.

When the submarine crisis arose in February, the Chilian Cabinet sent a protest to Berlin, affirming that the proposed measures restricted the legal rights of neutrals, as consecrated since ancient times, and that consequently Chile must hold herself at liberty to demand her rights if any acts of hostility should be committed against her ships. The protest was, therefore, more strongly worded than that of Argentina, and was much more in accordance with public sentiment in South America as a whole.

The country was more fortunate than Argentina, and was not seriously troubled either with international complications or with Labour agitations.

At the beginning of July, President Sanfuentes formed a

new Cabinet composed of the following statesmen Senor I. Ocornal (Interior), Senor A. Resa (Foreign Affairs); Senor A. Quezada (Finance); Senor A. Guarcello (Justice), Senor P. N. Montenegro (War), and Senor A. G. Errazuriz (Industry).

IX URUGUAY.

A general election was held in this republic on January 15. The result was curious. The Ministerialist, or so-called "Official" Party secured 67 out of the 123 seats in the Chamber of Deputies, but they received only a minority of the votes cast by the electors, that is, only 63,514 as against 65,171 cast for the opposition. The new legislature was opened on February 15.

When the unrestricted submarine campaign was announced by Germany, the Uruguayan Government sent a protest to Berlin. Diplomatic relations were not immediately severed, however, and when the United States entered the war the Uruguayan Government declared its neutrality. Nevertheless, the Government published a note expressing sympathy with the attitude of the United States. And on June 18 a formal declaration signed by the President and the Cabinet Ministers was issued stating that having regard to the principle of pan-American solidarity the Government had decided to declare that "no American country which, in defence of its rights, is in a state of war with nations of other continents, shall be treated as a belligerent." In October the Government definitely broke off relations with Germany.

X OTHER REPUBLICS.

Panama declared war upon Germany on April 10. Cuba and the Dominican Republic, being under the protection of the United States, also declared war on Germany. Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Bolivia severed relations with Berlin in the spring, and Peru, Costa Rica, and Ecuador subsequently took the same course of action.

A serious earthquake occurred in Salvador in June, and a similar disturbance destroyed a large part of Guatemala City at the end of the year.

CHAPTER IX.

AUSTRALASIA.

I. AUSTRALIA.

AT the opening of the year the federal authorities in Australia found themselves in a difficult position. The previous year had seen a series of crises in Australian politics. A great trial of strength had taken place between statesmen representing two quite distinct theories of Britannic unity. At the beginning

of 1916 two political parties had existed in Australia, the Liberals and the Labour Party. The latter were in power in federal affairs, Mr. W. M. Hughes being Premier. In the summer the Prime Minister, being dissatisfied with the number of recruits obtained by voluntary methods for the Australian Overseas Army, had declared in favour of conscription for foreign service—compulsion for home defence being already the law in this country. This proposal was condemned by the great majority of the Premier's own party, but was supported by nearly all Liberals. The Government submitted the proposal to a referendum in the autumn, and conscription was then defeated by a small majority. Bitter feeling had been aroused between Mr. Hughes and the majority of the Labour Party, and there was no prospect of a reunion of these two factions. It was therefore proposed during the autumn of 1916 that a coalition should be formed between the Hughesites and the Liberals, and in the State Legislature of New South Wales, where the position was precisely comparable, this course was actually adopted. Mr. Holman, the Hughesite Premier, formed a coalition with the Liberals of the State, and was thus able to outvote the local Labour Party. At first, Mr. Hughes preferred not to adopt this plan, and after the defeat of conscription he continued to carry on the government of the country by means of a Cabinet composed exclusively of his own immediate followers. The Ministry included Mr. Pearce, Mr. Jensen, Mr. Poynton, and others of the conscriptionist group. This was the state of affairs at the end of 1916.

In January the Liberals, of whom Mr. Cook was the leader, suggested to the Government that a "national" Ministry should be formed, including representatives of all three parties, and the Ministerialists declared themselves favourably disposed towards the idea. The anti-conscriptionists rejected the proposal, however, on the ground that their policy was too dissimilar from that of the other parties to render their entry into a coalition desirable or even practicable. This development was inevitable in the circumstances. The Liberals and the Hughesites persisted in negotiations between themselves, however, and in February an agreement was reached between these two parties to form a new Coalition Ministry. The Cabinet was sworn in on February 17 and was composed as follows:—

Prime Minister and Attorney-General—Mr. W. M. Hughes.
Minister of Marine—Mr. J. Cook.
Finance Minister—Sir J. Forrest.
Minister of Defence—Senator G. F. Pearce.
Minister of Railways—Senator W. A. Watt.
Minister of Customs—Mr. J. A. Jensen.
Minister of Interior and of Territories—Mr. P. M. Glynn.
Postmaster-General—Mr. W. Webster.
Assistant Attorney-General—Mr. L. E. Groom.
Vice-President of Cabinet—Senator E. D. Miller.
Minister without Portfolio—Senator E. J. Russell.

The new Ministry called itself "The Commonwealth War Government." On February 22 Mr. Hughes made a declaration of policy in the House of Representatives. He said that the new Cabinet had been formed specifically to prosecute the war and everything would be subordinated to this. The war was now raging more furiously than ever. He felt it, he said, a humiliation that the tumult of faction had drowned the voice of Australia calling her sons to defend her. Other nations were facing the conflict unitedly. Australia alone seemed unable to close her ranks in the face of the common enemy. The Government, however, would respect the decision of the country on the question of conscription. He urged his hearers to realise that the war was now reaching a terrific climax, "in which all things were possible." The speaker then referred to the forthcoming Imperial Conference in London, and said that he hoped that the Australian delegates would be able to leave for England immediately¹. The Government would adhere to the policy of a "White Australia," without any qualification. The federal authorities hoped to make such arrangements with the States as would obviate dual taxation of the same asset. Mr. Hughes said that the odious device of driving men out of employment in order to compel them to enlist would receive no countenance from him.

This speech was received enthusiastically by the majority of the House.

The Government brought in a motion asking the Imperial Parliament to prolong the life of the Commonwealth Legislature until October 8. This motion was carried in the Lower House, but in the Senate the Labour Party possessed a majority of two over the Coalition, and in addition a few Senators who were ordinarily to be reckoned as supporters of the Ministry would not support the Government on this point. Mr. Hughes was thus unable to induce the Senate to adopt this proposal, and he therefore advised the Governor-General that an immediate dissolution of Parliament was necessary. The elections were fixed for May 5.

A dissolution of the New South Wales Legislature also took place, and the State elections were fixed for March 23. Mr. Holman led the united Conscriptionist Party, now known as the "National Party," and Mr. D. Storey led the Labourites, Mr. Durack, hitherto leader of the Opposition, having resigned owing to ill-health. In the result the Government were maintained in power, but with a diminished majority. There were ninety seats in the Legislative Assembly, and of these the Government candidates won fifty-five, as compared with sixty-seven Ministerialist members in the previous Parliament. The existence of the system of second ballots in this State rendered the election statistics complex, but it appeared that the Nation-

¹ Owing to the uncertain political situation in Australia, however, no delegates were sent.

alists had about 300,000 supporters as against about 250,000 of the Labour Party. Over 40 per cent. of the electors did not take the trouble to vote.

At the beginning of March the Australian Senate carried by a large majority a resolution urging the British Government to confer Home Rule upon Ireland. The resolution stated that the Senate appreciated the benefits of Australian autonomy, and since the British Empire was now fighting "to maintain the right of self-government for all nations," a just measure of Home Rule ought to be accorded to Ireland without undue delay. The minority opposing the motion held that a Dominion Parliament ought not to interfere in what was a problem of the domestic politics of the United Kingdom.

It was announced in March that in the referendum on conscription held in the previous autumn, the voting among the troops had given approximately 72,000 votes for conscription and 58,000 against it.

The results of the Federal Elections were much more gratifying to the Nationalists than those of the New South Wales State pollings. Victoria, West Australia, and Tasmania voted heavily in favour of Mr Hughes. Fifty-three Nationalists were returned to the House of Representatives, as against twenty-two Labour members. Elections were also held for one half of the Senate, and the composition of that body after the poll was—Nationalists, 24, Labourites, 12. Arrangements were again made for polling among the troops, and the soldiers again voted in favour of Mr. Hughes, this time by a majority of about two to one.

Mr. Hughes was thus once more firmly seated in power, in the parliamentary sense, but he was faced by a powerful and energetic Opposition; and during the second half of the year the indications were, that all over the continent public opinion was drifting somewhat away from the Imperialist Government and towards the now very "advanced" Labour Party. The recruiting stream appeared to have almost dried up, and the Government almost despaired of maintaining the Australian Divisions at full strength.

During August, September, and October, serious strikes took place all over the Commonwealth. The most serious of these strikes was that of the New South Wales railwaymen, which began at the beginning of August. The original cause of this was comparatively trifling. The Commissioners of Railways of this State introduced a new card system of recording the details of men's work, and the employees objected to this on the ground that they feared it might mean what was popularly and aptly styled "speeding-up." The State Government announced that if, after three months' trial, the new card system proved to be unjust, it would be revised, and that each man should be given an opportunity of inspecting and himself initialising the particulars of his daily work. The workers refused to

agree to these reasonable suggestions, and strikes in other industries, partly sympathetic and partly independent, followed in all the States, except Tasmania. The New South Wales Railway strike lasted about six weeks, but in the middle of September the men agreed to accept the Government's terms. The other strikes, in New South Wales and elsewhere, ceased one by one, and by the end of October the whole Commonwealth was hard at work once more.

Federal finance was, of course, completely dominated by the requirements of the war. In the spring a loan of 20,000,000*l.* was issued, and the subscriptions to this amounted to 21,400,000*l.* In September the Federal Government introduced a Bill authorising further loans up to the amount of 80,000,000*l.*, these loans to bear interest at 4*½* per cent.

The last event of the year in Federal politics was the holding of a second referendum on conscription for overseas service. The number of volunteers now coming forward had fallen so low that Mr Hughes felt obliged to take a second vote, although he knew that another defeat on this question would be a serious blow to the prestige of the Ministry. The voting took place on December 20, and at the end of the year it was announced that the "Noes," that is, the anti-conscriptionists, had secured a majority of nearly 200,000 on a total poll of about 2,000,000. The majority against conscription in New South Wales was 140,000, and even the Australian Army voted for compulsion by only a small majority. In Western Australia there was a majority of about 30,000 in favour of Mr Hughes's proposal. At the end of the year it was believed that the Cabinet were contemplating the advisability of resignation; but no decision had been reached.

In October it was announced that the trans-Australian railway had been completed. This railway, the building of which was begun in 1912, ran from Port Augusta in South Australia to Kalgoorlie in Western Australia, a distance of 1,050 miles. The cost of this new line was 7,000,000*l.*

After the defeat of conscription at the referendum, the Labour Party issued a manifesto on war-aims. The manifesto declared that the war was the result of the capitalist organisation of society. The party asked for the immediate calling of a peace conference, the negotiations to begin on the basis of the evacuation of occupied territories, and the acceptance of the principle of the self-determination of peoples. The party also advocated the following conditions of peace: (1) international arbitration; (2) abolition of secret diplomacy, (3) abolition of trade in and private manufacture of munitions of war; (4) simultaneous abolition of conscription in all countries; (5) freedom of the seas.

In the political life of the States the most important event was the introduction by the Labour Government of Queensland of a proposal to abolish the Legislative Council of that State.

This Legislative Council, or Senate, was a nominated body, which had often vetoed Labourite Bills. The Bill abolishing the Upper House had been twice rejected by that Chamber, and the Government proceeded therefore to submit the Bill to a referendum. By the laws of the State, if the poll were favourable to the measure in these circumstances (that is, after two rejections by the Senate) the Bill would be presented to the Governor for signature and would become law in spite of the rejections by the Upper House. The electors of Queensland voted upon this question at the same time as the federal general election was proceeding, and the Government's proposal was defeated by a majority of 60,000 on a total poll of less than 300,000. Mr. T. J. Ryan, the Premier, did not resign in consequence of this defeat.

The general election in New South Wales has already been described. In the summer, Mr. Holman visited both England and America.

In November a general election was held in Victoria, and the two wings of the National Party were returned with a large majority. Mr. J. Bowser became Premier.

During the summer Coalition (conscriptionist) Ministries were formed in both South Australia and West Australia. Mr. Peake became Premier in South Australia and Mr. Lefroy became Prime Minister of West Australia. Queensland was the only State in the Commonwealth wherein there was an administration opposed to Mr. Hughes and to the policy of conscription.

II. NEW ZEALAND.

The life of this Dominion was once more dominated completely by the war, and the country continued to play a larger part in the conflict, in proportion to the size of its population, than any of the other three Overseas Dominions of the British Crown.

It will be remembered that in 1916 an Act was passed instituting a scheme of compulsory drafts to reinforce the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, the number of volunteers having fallen below the requirements. The nation as a whole was very favourable to this measure, but the Socialist Party were hostile to it. The Socialists were, however, not an influential party in New Zealand, being much weaker in numbers, relatively as well as actually, than were the Socialists of Australia. There was very little actual resistance to the enforcement of the Act. The legality of the Act was, however, disputed by some of the extremists. It was contended that it was beyond the competence of the Dominion Parliament to compel men to serve overseas. This point was raised in the Court of Appeal on April 4, when a number of pacifists were appealing against convictions for having uttered opinions contrary to the W:

Regulations¹ It was urged that the Act was *ultra vires*, in that the authority of the New Zealand Parliament was confined to the territorial limits of New Zealand. The four judges of the Appeal Court held, however, that the powers conferred by the Constitution Act upon the New Zealand Legislature enabling it to make laws for "the peace, order, and good government of New Zealand" were clearly sufficient to enable it to compel men to serve overseas in defence of the Empire of which New Zealand formed a part.

During April there was a serious coal strike, nearly all the coal mines of the country being affected. The grievances of the miners were political rather than economic, the miners being very hostile to the Compulsory Service Act. The Government agreed, however, to intimate to the Military Service Boards that every essential worker in a coal-mine or gold-mine should be exempted if he appealed, and this action of the Ministry, together with other concessions, seems to have appeased the strikers, and at the end of April they returned to work.

In the spring the two most important members of the Cabinet, Mr. W. F. Massey (Premier) and Sir J. C. Ward (Finance Minister), attended the Special War Conference of the Empire in London. The Ministers did not proceed to England for the express purpose of representing New Zealand at the Conference. It chanced that they were already in England when the British Government decided to hold the Conference. The presence in London of Sir Joseph Ward as well as the Premier was particularly opportune. Sir J. Ward had been leader of the Liberal Party which had united with the Reform Party of Mr. Massey in 1915 to form the Coalition Government, and he had always taken a keen interest in imperial problems. Mr. Massey and Sir J. Ward were away from New Zealand from August, 1916 to June, 1917, and during their absence Sir James Allen, Minister of Defence, held the post of Acting Prime Minister. On July 3 the two returned Ministers made speeches in Parliament recounting their activities abroad, more particularly the proceedings at the Imperial Conference. Sir Joseph Ward said that he had declared at the Conference that the people of New Zealand would in future claim a share in the control of foreign policy, to which, he thought, their services and sacrifices in the war had entitled them.

In the summer the London Colonial Office announced that the designation of the King's representative in New Zealand would be changed from Governor to Governor-General. The change was appropriate as a recognition of New Zealand's status as a "Dominion," a name which, in the terminology of

¹ These War Regulations in New Zealand were comparable to the Defence of the Realm Act in Great Britain, and, amongst other things, they penalised anti-war propaganda.

Britannic politics, has been confined in recent years to the great self-governing colonies.

Sir Joseph Ward introduced the Budget for 1917-18 on August 1. The revenue was estimated at 17,262,800*l* and the ordinary expenditure at 16,082,702*l*. It was expected that the war expenditure for the year would amount to about 20,000,000*l*. The Finance Minister stated that the national debt was expected to reach 150,000,000*l*. by March 31, 1918, and that the war expenditure would probably reach 50,000,000*l*. by June 30, 1918. A War Loan of 12,000,000*l*. was issued during August. The bonds were issued at par and bore interest at 4½ per cent. The loan was a great success, being over-subscribed by 3,500,000*l*.

Sir James Allen announced in August that, excluding the force sent to Samoa, New Zealand had sent 74,000 men to the various fronts up to date, and that there were 10,000 more in training. There had been 26,000 casualties, of which, unfortunately, the killed numbered no fewer than 7,500.

The Expeditionary Force Reserve was organised into two Divisions. The First Division consisted of single men and widowers without children. The Second Division comprised married men and widowers with children. By the autumn of 1917 the compulsory drafts had exhausted the supply of men from the First Division, other than those whom it was deemed necessary to exempt, and hence it became necessary to begin calling up men from the Second Division. It was arranged that the men should be classified according to the number of children they possessed, and that those having larger families should be called up last.

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS IN 1917.

JANUARY.

1 The transport *Ivernia* was sunk by a submarine in the Mediterranean, with a loss of 120 soldiers and thirty-three of the crew.

— The King addressed a telegram of New Year congratulations to the President of the French Republic.

— The baking of standard bread became compulsory.

— No list of New Year Honours was issued (*v. Feb. 13*).

— The new regulations came into force, under which a 50 per cent. increase was made in railway fares; and the trains became fewer and slower.

2 *The Times* announced the appointment of Lord Granville, Counsellor of the British Embassy in Paris, as British representative to the Provisional Government of M. Venizelos at Salonika.

— Mr. T. B. Morison, K.C., Solicitor-General for Scotland, was returned unopposed for Inverness-shire, in succession to Sir John Dewar who had been raised to the peerage.

— Lord Curzon of Kedleston was married to Mrs. Grace Elvina Duggan, widow of Mr. Alfred Duggan, of Buenos Aires.

3 Lord Cowdray was appointed Chairman of the Air Board.

— At a railway accident at Routh Station, near Edinburgh, twelve persons were killed and nearly 100 injured.

5 *The Times* announced the appointment of General Sir Edmund G. Barrow, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., as member of the Council of India, in succession to General Sir Charles Egerton, G.C.B., whose term of office was due to expire in February.

6. Mr. Charles Harford Lloyd was appointed organist, choirmaster, and composer at His Majesty's Chapel Royal at St. James's Palace.

8. It was announced in Paris that General Ruquoy had been appointed Chief of the General Staff of the Belgian Army in succession to the late General Wielemans.

8. It was announced that Sir Walter Townley had been appointed successor to Sir Alan Johnstone as British Minister at the Hague

9. H M S. *Cornwallis* was sunk by an enemy submarine in the Mediterranean, with a loss of thirteen men

— Commencement of the exchange of British and German interned civilians of over 45

— The Hotel Cecil, with the exception of the East wing occupied by the Constitutional Club, was taken over by the Office of Works on behalf of the reconstituted Air Board.

— Opening of the French Parliamentary Session.

— A meeting organised by the Union of Democratic Control was broken up at Walthamstow.

10. *The Times* announced that Sir Sam Fay, general manager of the Great Central Railway, was about to take over the control of military munition train movements in this country in connection with the newly created Department of Military Railways.

— Dr W. G. Alcock, M.V.O., was appointed by the Dean and Chapter organist of Salisbury Cathedral

11. H M. Seaplane carrier *Ben-My-Chree* was sunk by gunfire in Kastelorizo Harbour (Asia Minor) with a loss of one officer and four men wounded

13. The late Sir Charles Cayzer, Bart., shipowner, left personal estate valued at 1,899,125/-

15-16. The War Cabinet held a series of conferences with General Nivelle, Commander-in-Chief of the French Armies, and Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig.

15. *The Times* announced that Mr. E. A. Prosser, general manager of the Rhymney Railway Company, South Wales, had accepted the position of Deputy Director of Military Train Movements at the War Office under Sir Sam Fay

16. Mr. Lynden Macassey, K.C., was appointed "Director of Shipyard Labour," under the Third Sea Lord.

17. *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached 6,000,000/-

— Five men were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for a charge of conspiring to defeat the Military Service Acts by forging a medical history sheet.

18. Sir Maurice Hill, K.C., was appointed Judge of the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division), in place of Mr. Justice Bargrave Deane, resigned.

— At the Annual General Meeting of the Bar, a proposal to admit women to the Bar was negatived by a large majority.

19. A great explosion occurred at a Munitions Factory near London, with heavy loss of life (*v. English History*).

— The late Sir Joseph Beecham, Bart., left estate valued at 1,000,000/-

20. The King conferred the G.C M.G. on Lieut.-General (Temporary General) Sir Archibald J. Murray, K.C.B., K.C M G , C V.O., D.S.O.

24. The King conferred the G.C B on Sir William Robertson and on Sir Alfred Keogh, Director-General of the Royal Army Medical Corps. The K.C B. was awarded to Surgeon-General Donovan and to Colonel (Temporary Surgeon-General) N. R. Howse, V.C., of the Australian Army Medical Corps.

— M. Sergi Dimitrievitch Sazonoff was appointed Russian Ambassador in London (v. May 22).

25 The *Scotsman* newspaper celebrated its centenary

— H M. auxiliary cruiser *Laurentic* was sunk off the Irish coast by a mine, twelve officers and 109 men being saved.

— A small German vessel bombarded the Suffolk coast, causing no casualties and insignificant damage.

29. M Auguste Rodin, the sculptor, was married to Mlle. Rose Beurre

30. The King appointed Field-Marshal H R H. the Duke of Connaught, Colonel-in-Chief of "The Volunteer Force"

— *The Times* announced that Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the Unionist member for Bewdley, had been appointed a Junior Lord of the Treasury.

31. The total number of German casualties reported in official German lists up to the end of January was 4,087,692.

FEBRUARY.

1 *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. E V. Hiley as Deputy-Director of National Service, and of Mrs H. J. Tennant as Director of the Women's Department.

5 Count Plunkett was elected to Parliament as member for North Roscommon by a majority of 627 votes over the combined polls of the official Nationalist and the Independent candidates. As a Sinn Fein member he made no attempt to take his seat.

— Mr Arthur Samuels, K C., was elected to Parliament as member for Dublin University by a majority of 802 over Sir Robert Woods, M D.

6. The estate of the late Mr. Thomas Fenwick Harrison was valued at 1,438,353*l.*

7. Opening of Parliament

— The Anchor liner *California*, of nearly 9,000 tons, was torpedoed without warning and sunk by a German submarine while on a voyage from New York to Glasgow. Forty-three lives were lost.

8 One of H.M. torpedo-boat destroyers on patrol duty in the Channel struck a mine and sank, all the officers being lost.

9. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir W. G. Ellison Macartney, K C.M.G., as Governor of Western Australia, and of Mr. F. A. N. Newdegate, M.P., as Governor of Tasmania.

9. The Admiralty transport *Tyndareus*, having on board a battalion of the Middlesex Regiment, struck a mine off Cape Agulhas, but the ship and all hands were saved.

12. The price of the 4 lb. loaf was raised from $10\frac{1}{2}d$ to 11d.

— The V C was awarded to Sergt. Thomas Mottershead, who had already died, on account of conspicuous bravery in the air.

13. The list of New Year Honours was issued. A barony was conferred upon Sir Hugh Graham, founder and proprietor of the *Montreal Evening Star*. Mr W. P. Schreiner, C M G, High Commissioner in London for the Union of South Africa, became a Privy Councillor; and Lieut.-General Sir Bryan Mahon, Commander-in Chief in Ireland, an Irish Privy Councillor. Seven baronetcies were conferred, including Sir R. Sothern Holland, Sir Charles Wakefield, the retiring Lord Mayor of London, and Sir Charles Mathews, Director of Public Prosecutions. Twenty-eight knighthoods were awarded, mostly to war-workers.

— Sir J. H. Malden (L. Coalition) was elected member of Parliament for the Rossendale Division of Lancashire by a majority of 4,215 over the "Peace by Negotiation" candidate.

— Announcement of the sinking of the White Star liner *Afric*, of 11,999 tons, with a loss of about twenty lives.

15. Announcement that the Board of Trade would take possession of all the coal-mines in the United Kingdom for the period of the war; and that a new department would be set up to control the coal-mines, under Mr. Guy Calthrop.

19. The price of *The Times* was raised from $1\frac{1}{2}d$. to 2d.

— Sir Arthur Lee, K.C.B., M.P., was appointed Director-General of Food Production.

20. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, K.C.S.I., C I E., was appointed Controller of the Department of the War Office dealing with timber.

21. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. John Buchan as Director of Information under the Prime Minister.

— The Venerable W F Norris was appointed Dean of York.

23. The King opened the School of Oriental Studies at the London Institution.

25. Broadstairs and Margate were shelled by torpedo-boat destroyers, damaging about ten houses, and killing a woman and a child.

— The Cunard liner *Laconia* was torpedoed without warning, six persons being killed and six injured.

28. Two doctors and two clerks were sentenced to from nine to eighteen months' imprisonment in the second division, for enabling persons at the White City Recruiting Offices to escape military service. The conviction of one of the doctors was subsequently quashed.

— The total number of German casualties reported in official German lists up to the end of February amounted to 4,148,163.

MARCH.

1. One of His Majesty's destroyers was sunk with all hands in the North Sea, probably from striking a mine.

— A hostile aeroplane dropped some bombs at Broadstairs, slightly injuring a woman.

5 The King received Lord Milner on his return from the Allied Conference in Petrograd.

— The Ministry of Shipping was installed in a new building in St. James's Park.

6 The King approved the posthumous grant of the V.C. to Commander L. W. Jones, R.N., for conspicuous bravery during the battle of Jutland.

7. *The Times* announced that Lord Devonport had appointed Mr. John W. Dennis as director (unpaid) of the section of the Ministry of Food dealing with potatoes, other vegetables, and fruit.

9. Sir Spencer Harcourt Butler, K.C.S.I., was appointed Lieut.-Governor of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in succession to Sir James Meston, and Sir Reginald Henry Craddock, K.C.S.I., was appointed Lieut.-Governor of Burma, in succession to Sir Harcourt Butler.

10. The V.C. was conferred on Captain H. W. Murray, D.S.O., Australian Infantry, and upon Sergt. E. J. Mott, Border Regiment, for conspicuous gallantry.

12. General Smuts arrived in London from South Africa.

13 Sir Home Gordon Bart, partner in Messrs. Williams & Norgate, was appointed Controller of the Staff of the National Service Department.

14. Death of the Duchess of Connaught (v. Obit.).

— The Marquess of Salisbury, G.C.V.O., C.B., and the Marquess of Bath were gazetted Knights of the Garter.

15 One of H.M. torpedo-boat destroyers struck a mine in the Channel and sank, with a loss of twenty-nine lives.

— *The Times* announced that Sir Sydney Olivier, K.C.M.G., was about to vacate the office of Permanent Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, and would be succeeded by Mr. A. D. Hall, F.R.S.

— The V.C. was awarded to Captain (temporary Major) Cuthbert Bromley (since drowned), to Sergt. F. E. Stubbs (since died of wounds), and to Cpl. (now Sergt.) John Grimshaw.

— Sir Wilfred Collet, K.C.M.G., Governor of British Honduras, was appointed Governor of British Guiana.

16. A hostile aeroplane dropped bombs at Westgate-on-Sea, causing little damage.

— Hostile airships attacked the South-Eastern counties, but no casualties were reported.

17. Resignation of M. Briand.

17. Announcement that General Sir Charles Comyn Egerton, G C B , D S.O , had been promoted to the rank of Field-Marshal.

— Ramsgate was shelled by enemy destroyers, which also sank one of His Majesty's destroyers to the eastward of the Straits of Dover.

19 Mr. James Chambers, K.C , M P., was appointed Solicitor-General for Ireland.

— The French battleship *Danton* was torpedoed by a hostile submarine in the Mediterranean

20. The King appointed the Duke of Buccleuch to be a Knight of the Thistle; and conferred a Peerage of the United Kingdom on Viscount Valentia, M V.O.

— Lord Edmund Bernard Talbot, M V.O., D.S.O , M.P., was appointed Deputy Earl Marshal of England.

— Mr J. Bertrand Watson (Coalition) was elected Parliamentary Representative for Stockton-on-Tees by a majority of 7,045 over Mr. Edward Backhouse (Peace by Negotiation).

— Lord Crewe was elected Chairman of the London County Council.

— The British hospital ship *Asturias* was torpedoed without warning

21 The Admiralty announced that two of His Majesty's mine-sweeping vessels had struck mines and sunk, fourteen lives being lost.

23. At Lincoln English wheat advanced to 90s. a quarter

26. The price of the 4 lb. loaf was raised from 11*d.* to 1*s.*, being thus double the pre-war price.

— Mr. Kennedy Jones, M.P., was appointed Director-General of the Food Economy Department of the Ministry of Food

— Mr. James Bennett Brunyate, C.S.I., C I.E , was appointed a member of the Council of India in succession to Sir Theodore Morison, K.C.S.I , K.C.I.E.

28. The Admiralty announced that one of His Majesty's destroyers had struck a mine in the Channel and sunk, four officers and seventeen men being saved.

29. Gainsborough's portrait of Miss Elizabeth Tyler was sold for 3,250 guineas.¹

30. The British hospital ship *Gloucester Castle* was torpedoed without warning in mid-Channel ; all the wounded were successfully removed from the ship.

31. The number of German casualties officially reported for March was 54,803.

— Retail prices of food in England showed an increase of 94 per cent. as compared with July, 1914.

APRIL.

2. Admiral of the Fleet, Sir Arthur Fanshawe, G.C.B , G.C.V.O., was placed on the retired list on account of age , and Admiral Sir George Callaghan, G.C B., G C.V.O , was promoted to be Admiral of the Fleet.

2 Mr. Andrew Weir was appointed in charge of a new Department of the War Office, for dealing with the commercial side of the business of supplying the Army.

— The late Mr. Francis Reckitt, manufacturer of Reckitt's Blue, left unsettled estate of the gross value of 1,007,165*l.*

3 Sir J. Fleming (Liberal) was elected to the Parliamentary representation of South Aberdeen by 3,238 votes, against 1,507 for Prot J. R. Watson (Ind. National) and 333 for Mr. Pethick Lawrence (Peace by Negotiation).

5. A hostile aeroplane passed over Kentish coast towns and dropped eight bombs without any resulting damage.

— The bank-rate was reduced from 5*½* to 5 per cent.

6. The United States declared War on Germany.

8. Easter Sunday.

— "Summer Time" came into force, the clocks being put forward one hour at 2 a.m.

10. One of H.M. patrol vessels struck a mine and sank in the Channel.

11. The King conferred the K.C.M.G. on Major-General G. V. Kembell, C.B., D.S.O., in recognition of Distinguished Services in the field in Mesopotamia.

— The late Mrs. Amy Lea left estate valued at 340,611*l.* gross.

14. A large squadron of British and French aeroplanes bombarded Freiburg as a reprisal for attacks on British hospital ships.

15. The British transport *Arcadian* was torpedoed by an enemy submarine in the Eastern Mediterranean, and sank with a loss of 279 men.

— The British transport *Cameroma* was torpedoed by an enemy submarine in the Eastern Mediterranean, with a loss of 140 men.

17. The hospital ships *Donegal* and *Lanfranc*, while transporting wounded to British ports, were torpedoed without warning, forty-two men of the *Donegal* and thirty-four of the *Lanfranc* were lost.

20 The King and Queen, Princess Mary, and Queen Alexandra, and the Ambassador of the United States attended a service at St. Paul's Cathedral, on the entry of the United States into the War.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir Arthur Thring, K.C.B., as Clerk of the Parliaments.

21. The King conferred the V.C. on Commander Gordon Campbell, D.S.O., R.N.

— The Prime Minister returned to London after a series of conferences with the French and Italian Governments in a stationary train at St. Jean de Maurienne, near the Mont Cenis tunnel.

— The late Mr. R. B. Thomas left property of the value of 447,588*l.*

24 The Rev. T. G. Gardiner was appointed to a Canonry of Canterbury in succession to Canon E. A. Stuart.

26. Sir Ernest George, A.R.A., was elected a Royal Academician, and Mr. S. Melton Fisher was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy.

— Enemy destroyers fired towards Ramsgate, killing or wounding five persons.

27. Gainsborough's "Portrait of Francis Greville" was sold at Christie's for 2,600 guineas.

— *The Times* announced that Mr. John Murray had taken over the publishing business of Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co.

— General Sir James Willcocks, G.C.M.G., etc., was appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Bermuda, in succession to Sir G. M. Bullock, K.C.B.

— The estate of the late Lord Cromer was valued at 117,608/-

— Seven men were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment up to one year and nine months, on a charge of conspiring to defeat the provisions of the Military Service Acts.

30. General Pétain was appointed Chief of the General Staff of the French Army at the Ministry of War.

— The Stewards of the Jockey Club, having received an intimation that the War Cabinet considered it undesirable that further racing should take place after the conclusion of the First Spring Meeting, cancelled all fixtures after that date (May 4).

— The total number of German casualties officially reported during April was 42,838.

MAY.

2. One of H.M. destroyers struck a mine in the Channel and sank, with a loss of one officer and sixty-one men.

4. The British transport *Transylvania* was torpedoed in the Mediterranean, with a loss of 413 men.

5. One of H.M. mine-sweeping vessels was torpedoed and sank, with a loss of two officers and twenty men.

— A K.C.M.G. was conferred on Colonel (temporary Brigadier-General) R. M. M. Anderson, G.M.G., Australian Imperial Force, in recognition of his valuable services in connection with the war.

7. A hostile aeroplane dropped four bombs over the outskirts of North-East London, killing one man, and injuring a man and a woman.

10. Mr. J. McGuiness (Sinn Fein) was returned to Parliament for South Longford by a majority of thirty-seven over Mr. J. P. McKenna (Nationalist). Mr. McGuiness was still in prison for his association with the Irish rebellion.

11. General Dragomiroff was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Russian forces on the Northern Front, in succession to General Ruzsky.

11 The King awarded the V C to Second Lieut (temporary Capt) P H Cherry, M C, late Australian Imperial Force, to Second Lieut. G. E. Cates, late Rifle Brigade, and to Pte. C. Cox, Bedfordshire Regiment.

12 Announcement that within the next week volunteers would be accepted for the Army between the ages of 41 and 50.

13. New restrictions came into force under the Defence of the Realm Act, prohibiting the use of motor spirit for hired cars, except under special circumstances.

— Motor-omnibus strike began in London.

14 British Naval Forces destroyed Zeppelin L 22 in the North Sea.

— An action for fraud brought by Mr Gruban, a naturalised German, against Mr. Handel Booth, M.P., ended in a verdict for the plaintiff with 4,750*l* damages.

— The King and Queen began a tour through the counties of Cheshire, Lancashire, and Flintshire, inspecting munition factories

15 At a French Cabinet Meeting, General Pétain was appointed to the command of the Northern and North-Eastern Armies, his place as Chief of the General Staff being taken by General Foch. General Nivelle was appointed to the command of an Army Group.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. Canon Hastings Rashdall as Dean of Carlisle, in place of the late Dr. Barker.

16. The Admiralty announced that a flotilla of United States destroyers had arrived in this country, to assist in the war.

— The War Office announced that Major-General J L. van Deventer, C B, had been appointed to command the Military Forces in East Africa.

17 End of the omnibus strike in London.

18. End of the Royal tour through munition factories.

— A complete unit of the United States Medical Corps arrived in England

22. Announcement that a Civil Aerial Transport Committee had been appointed, under the chairmanship of Lord Northcliffe, to inquire into aerial civil communications after the war.

— Announcement that M. Isvolsky would be the new Russian Ambassador in London, instead of M. Sazonoff, as previously announced.

— The London County Council decided to suspend halfpenny fares on the Council tramways.

23. Dog shows became illegal.

— The late Duke of Norfolk left estate valued at 300,000*l*.

— An abortive Zeppelin raid took place over East Anglia

25 A large squadron of about sixteen enemy aircraft attacked the south-east of England between 5.15 and 6.30, killing seventy-six persons and injuring 174, mostly in Folkestone.

26. H.M. hospital ship *Dover Castle* was torpedoed without warning in the Mediterranean

27. The Ambassadors, Ministers, and other representatives of Allied Nations met at the French Embassy to receive an address expressing the fraternal sentiments of the citizens of London.

29. It was announced that the Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, M.P., had undertaken a mission to Russia on behalf of the Government, and that the Rt. Hon. George Barnes, M.P., had become a member of the War Cabinet during Mr. Henderson's absence.

30. *The Times* announced that the Ministry of Munitions had decided to request the Scottish Command to allow the men deported from the Clyde area to return to their homes (*v. A.R.*, 1916, p. 94).

— The late Lord Masham left estate of the gross value of 1,016,150*l.*

31. *The Times* announced that a provisional agreement had been concluded for a fusion of interests between the P. & O. Company and the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand.

— The late Mr. Seth Taylor, a miller, left estate valued at 1,158,213*l.*

— The list of German losses published for the month of May amounted to 116,137.

JUNE.

1. Announcement that Lord Devonport had resigned from the Ministry of Food.

— Surgeon-General William H. Norman, C.B., succeeded Sir Arthur W. May, K.C.B., F.R.C.S., K.H.P., as Director-General of the Medical Department of the Navy.

— Archdeacon E. H. Winnington-Ingram was appointed Canon of Hereford.

2. The King held a special investiture in Hyde Park for the bestowal of decorations on 351 officers and men of the Army and Navy and members of the nursing service.

— The British transport *Cameronian* was torpedoed and sunk in the Eastern Mediterranean with a loss of two military officers and fifty other ranks, the captain and one officer of the ship, and nine men of the crew.

4. The King's birthday honours included five new barons. Col. M. Lockwood, M.P., Col. Chaloner, M.P., Sir Frederick Smith, Major-General Sir Ivor Herbert, M.P., and Sir William Lever, Lord Devonport, Lord Farquhar, and Lord Astor became Viscounts. Viscount French was appointed a Knight of the Order of St. Patrick. There were eight new Privy Councillors, twenty-five Baronetcies, and forty-six Knighthoods.

— Mr. J. W. Cawston, C.B., was appointed Deputy-Master of the Mint, in succession to Sir Thomas Elliott, K.C.B.

5. The House of Commons re-assembled after the Whitsun Recess.

— Registration Day in the United States.

— Essex and Kent were attacked by about eighteen aeroplanes; two persons were killed and about thirty injured, but little other damage was done. About half the aeroplanes were destroyed.

— A German destroyer was sunk by gun-fire in the North Sea.

7. *The Times* announced that Lord Northcliffe had sailed for America, by invitation of the War Cabinet, to co-ordinate the work of the several British missions.

8. General Pershing, Commander-in-Chief of the United States Expeditionary Force, arrived in London with a large staff

— Engineer Rear-Admiral George G. Goodwin, C.B., became Engineer-in-Chief of H.M. Fleet in succession to Engineer Vice-Admiral Sir Henry J. Oram, K.C.B., F.R.S.

— Mr Henry M. Grayson was appointed Director of Ship Repairing Work to the Admiralty.

— Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan was appointed a member of the Council of India, in succession to Sir Abbas Ali Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

9. Mr. Balfour arrived in London at the conclusion of his mission in Canada and the United States

12. Abdication of King Constantine of Greece.

— The House of Lords re-assembled after the Whitsun recess

— Mr. J. F. Hope stated in the House of Commons that the number of British combatant prisoners of war was 1,937 officers and 43,194 men.

13. H.M. armed merchant cruiser *Avenger* was torpedoed in the North Sea, one man being lost

— About fifteen aeroplanes dropped bombs over the East End of London, killing 104 persons and injuring 423

— An explosion occurred in a munition factory at Ashton-under-Lyne, as a result of which from forty to fifty people were killed and about 100 injured.

14. Zeppelin L 43 was destroyed by British Naval Forces in the North Sea.

— The V.C. was awarded to five officers and men for conspicuous bravery in the war.

15. Mr Bonar Law announced that Lord Rhondda had accepted the post of Food Controller.

17. Two Zeppelins raided the coasts of Kent and East Anglia, killing three persons and injuring twenty. One of them was brought down by a British airman, and three prisoners were rescued from the airship.

— The temperature in London reached 89 degrees in the shade.

19. Captain Carey Evans, I.M.S., was married to Miss Lloyd George, elder daughter of the Prime Minister.

— Properties of the German Banks in the City of London were sold for a total of 260,500/-

20. Announcement that the King had determined that those Princes of his family who were his subjects and bore German names and titles should relinquish those titles and adopt British surnames. The following peerages were conferred:—

The Duke of Teck, Marquess of Cambridge.

Prince Alexander of Teck, Earl of Athlone.

Prince Louis of Battenberg, Marquess of Milford Haven.

Prince Alexander of Battenberg, Marquess of Carisbrooke

20. Major-General Currie, C.B., was appointed to command the Canadian Forces.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev R. C. Toynt as Canon of Southwark

22. *The Times* announced that the King was about to institute two new orders, in recognition of services rendered by British subjects and their Allies in connection with the war. The first was an order of Knighthood, called "The Order of the British Empire," consisting of five classes for both sexes. The second was "The Order of the Companions of Honour," open also to both sexes

23. The P & O. Liner *Mongolia*, with mails from London, sank off Bombay as a result of striking a mine.

26. *The Times* announced the following two appointments to the Council of India. Sir Prabhshankar Dalpatram Pattani, K.C.I.E., and Mr Bhupendra Nath Basu.

— Lord Abinger was married to Mme. de Serignac, the same Mme. Steinheil who was acquitted by the French Tribunal of Justice in 1908 of murdering her husband and mother

27. The King returned to London after paying a visit to the Grand Fleet.

— The King awarded the V.C. to eight officers and men for conspicuous gallantry.

— A Petrol Control Department of the Board of Trade was constituted to take over the duties of the Petrol Control Committee. Sir Evan Jones, Bart., M.I.C.E., was Controller, and Mr. P. G. L. Webb, Deputy-Controller of the new Department.

— The British transport *Armadale* was torpedoed and sunk by an enemy submarine in the Atlantic, with a loss of six soldiers, one passenger, and one officer and three men of the crew

28. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. U. F. Wintour, C.B., C.M.G., as Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Food, in place of Sir Henry Rew, K.C.B., who had resigned.

29. *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached 7,000,000*l.*

— The Rt. Hon W. Hayes Fisher, M.P., became President of the Local Government Board; Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Board; and Mr. Cecil Beck, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to National Service.

— Mr. H G Rooth was appointed a Metropolitan Police Magistrate in place of Mr. Fordham, who had resigned on account of ill-health.

30. Announcement that General Sir E. H. H. Allenby, K.C.B., had arrived in Egypt and taken over the command of the Expeditionary Force

— The total number of German casualties officially reported during the month of June amounted to 166,547.

JULY

2 A "National Baby Week" campaign was inaugurated, for the purpose of promoting interest in saving infant life and ensuring the welfare of mothers and children. The Queen opened a Child's Welfare and Mothercraft Exhibition at Westminster

4. "Independence Day" was celebrated in London, and the American Flag flown from many buildings

— Harwich was attacked by from twelve to fourteen German aeroplanes, the casualties being eleven killed and thirty-six injured.

5 Announcement that one of His Majesty's destroyers of an old type had struck a mine in the North Sea and sunk. There were eighteen survivors.

— Dr. J H Bell was sentenced to six months hard labour on a charge of inducing synovitis in a soldier, to enable him to avoid service.

6. One of His Majesty's destroyers was torpedoed by an enemy submarine in the North Sea, one officer and seven men being killed.

7. London was raided in the morning by about twenty German aeroplanes, forty-three persons being killed and 197 injured.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir John Collie as Director of Neurasthenic Institutions.

9 The battleship *Vanguard* blew up while at anchor as the result of an internal explosion, and sank immediately. There were only three survivors among those on board.

10 The estate of the late Mr. Leopold de Rothschild, C.V.O., was valued provisionally at 1,500,000*l.*

— Mr Austen Chamberlain announced his resignation of the office of Secretary of State for India (*v. English History*)

— At a Council meeting of the Royal College of Surgeons, Sir George H. Makins, K.C.M.G., C.B., was elected President for the ensuing Collegiate year.

13. *The Times* announced that Lord Pirrie, K.P., was about to become a commercial member of the Advisory Board for assisting the Surveyor-General of Supply at the War Office.

— Sir Abraham Garrod Thomas (Coalition) was returned to Parliament for South Monmouthshire by the record majority of 6,042 over Mr. B Pardoe Thomas (Independent)

14. The Kaiser accepted the resignation of the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Bethmann Hollweg, and appointed as his successor Herr Michaelis, Prussian Commissioner in the Office of the Food Controller.

— Celebration in London of France's Day—the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille.

15. The King conferred the K.C.B. (Military Division) on Captain Reginald Yorke Tyrwhitt, C.B., D.S.O., R.N.

16. The late Mr. J C Cuninghame left personal estate valued at 817,517*l.*

16. Retail food prices were estimated on the average to show an increase of 104 per cent. compared with July, 1914.

17. The King abandoned all German titles for himself and family ; and issued a proclamation that his House and Family should henceforth be known as the House and Family of Windsor

— *The Times* announced the resignation of Mr. Horace Smith, the London magistrate.

— Lord Stanley, elder son of Lord Derby, was married to the Hon. Sybil Cadogan, eldest daughter of the late Lord Chelsea

— The Earl of Airlie was married to Lady Alexandra Coke, younger daughter of Lord Leicester.

18. Celebration of the centenary of the death of Jane Austen

19. The Marquess of Carisbrooke, elder son of the late Prince Henry of Battenberg, was married to Lady Irene Denison, only daughter of the Earl of Londesborough.

20. Major H. A. Wernher, son of the late Sir Julius Wernher, was married to Countess Zia Torby.

21. *The Times* announced that Mr Kennedy Jones, M.P., had resigned his position as Director of Food Economy.

22. From fifteen to twenty German aeroplanes raided the East Coast, the casualties being thirteen killed and twenty-six injured.

— H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Otway* was torpedoed in Northern waters, and sunk ; ten men being killed by the explosion and the rest saved.

24. An Order of the Minister of Munitions was published, taking possession of all iron ore mines in the counties of Cumberland and Lancashire.

26. The highest price ever recorded by the Estate Exchange was bid at the Auction Mart ; namely, 575,000*l.* for a large block of shares in the Pacific Phosphate Company (Limited).

28. A Royal Warrant was published as an Army Order, authorising the formation of a new Corps in the British Army, to be called the Tank Corps.

30. Mr. Winston Churchill was re-elected at the Dundee bye-election by a majority of 5,266 over Mr. Scrymgeour (Prohibitionist).

— The Admiralty announced that H.M.S. *Ariadne* had been torpedoed and sunk, thirty-eight men being killed by the explosion and the rest saved.

31. The total number of German casualties officially reported during July amounted to 100,949.

AUGUST.

1. An explosion at a munitions factory in South Wales resulted in six killed and three injured.

— In the last four days 3.71 inches of rain fell in London.

2. The King approved the award of the V.C. to ten officers, non-commissioned officer, and men for conspicuous bravery.
3. Third anniversary of the declaration of war on Germany.
 - The Holland-Amerika steamer *Noordam* of 12,531 tons ran on a mine off Texel, without being sunk.
4. The late Duchess of Connaught left estate valued at 125,611*l.*
6. Grouse-shooting became legal
7. Announcement that Vice-Admiral Sir Rosslyn E. Wemyss, K.C.B., C.M.G., M.V.O., had been appointed Second Sea Lord, in succession to Admiral Sir Cecil Burney, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.
 - Mr. Alan Garrett Anderson (late Vice-Chairman of the Wheat Commission) became Controller in the vacancy created by the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir Eric C. Geddes, K.C.B., M.P., as First Lord of the Admiralty
8. The Allied Conference, which had recently met in Paris, resumed its meetings in London.
9. A factory accident at the Ajax Chemical Works, Barking, resulted in the deaths of thirteen women and girls.
10. *The Times* announced that Mr. Neville Chamberlain had resigned the office of Director-General of National Service, and that he would be succeeded by Brigadier-General A. C. Geddes.
 - The late Sir Charles Holcroft, Bart., left estate of the value of 1,599,677*l.*
11. The V.C. was awarded to Capt. W. A. Bishop, D.S.O., M.C., Canadian Cavalry and Royal Flying Corps, in recognition of a single-handed attack upon an aerodrome.
- Mr. A. W. Bairstowe, K.C., was appointed Recorder of Scarborough
- A bye-election at Kilkenny City resulted in a majority of 380 for the Sinn Fein candidate, Mr. W. P. Cosgrave.
12. Aeroplanes dropped bombs at Southend and Margate, killing about twenty-five persons and injuring fifty.
13. *The Times* announced the resignation of Mr. Arthur Henderson from the Government. Mr. George Barnes was appointed to succeed him in the War Cabinet.
15. Announcement that Sir Edward Letchworth had resigned the position of Grand Secretary to the United Grand Lodge of Freemasons of England, and had been succeeded by Mr. P. Colville Smith.
 - Announcement that one of His Majesty's destroyers had struck a mine in the North Sea and sunk; the captain, two officers, and forty-three men being saved.
 - American troops marched through London behind the flag of the Republic.
 - The House of Commons carried without debate a resolution for the removal during the recess of the grille in front of the Ladies' Gallery.

15. The Home Secretary made an order under the Defence of the Realm Regulations for the prohibition of whistling for cabs in London.

17. Captain Charles Bathurst, M.P., was appointed Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Sugar Supply, in place of Lord Devonport resigned.

18. The following new Ministerial appointments were announced —

Right Hon. John Hodge, M.P.—Minister of Pensions.

Mr. George H. Roberts, M.P.—Minister of Labour.

Mr. A. C. Geddes—Minister of National Service.

Mr. George J. Wardle, M.P.—Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade.

— The late Mr. G. T. Bates, shipowner, left estate valued at 550,973/-

21. British light forces destroyed an enemy Zeppelin off the coast of Jutland.

— Enemy airships attacked the Yorkshire coast, doing slight damage.

22. Major-General Sir John E. Capper, K.C.B., was appointed Director-General of the Tank Corps.

— Enemy aeroplanes dropped bombs on Ramsgate, Margate, and Dover, killing eleven and injuring thirteen persons.

23. Announcement that Lord Granville had been appointed British Minister at Athens, in place of Sir Francis Elliot.

— A Committee was appointed, under the Chairmanship of Sir Francis Howard, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., to proceed to France to inquire into various matters connected with the *personnel* and administration of the Army Medical Services in that country.

25. The first lists were published of appointments to the two new Orders—the Order of the British Empire and the Order of the Companions of Honour—instituted in recognition of services rendered during the War. H.M. the Queen, Lady Paget, Mrs. Katherine Furse, the Hon. Lady Lawley, and Lady Reid were appointed Dames Grand Cross of the British Empire. Among the Knights Grand Cross were the Duke of Connaught, Lord Emmott, Lord Moulton, Sir Eric Geddes, K.C.B., Sir Arthur Pearson, Bart., and Lord Sydenham. The Companions of Honour included Lieut-General Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, Marchioness of Lansdowne, Lord Burnham, and Sir Frank Swettenham, G.C.M.G.

— The police raided the London offices of the Union of Democratic Control.

— Mr. G. H. Roberts, the new Minister of Labour, was returned unopposed for Norwich.

28. Much damage was caused to corn crops all over the country by a gale and rainstorm.

29. An Order was issued by the Food Controller, fixing wholesale maximum prices for meat, and regulating the butchers' prices to the public.

29. The V.C. was awarded to Skipper Joseph Watt, R.N.R., for most conspicuous gallantry during the action in the Straits of Otranto on May 15.

31. The late Mr. G. J. Drummond of Drummond's Bank left estate of the gross value of 766,251*l.*

SEPTEMBER.

1. British light forces operating off the coast of Jutland destroyed four enemy mine-sweeping vessels

2. Hostile aeroplanes crossed the East Kent coast, and dropped bombs on Dover causing few casualties.

3. Hostile aeroplanes crossed the South-East coast, and dropped bombs in the Isle of Thanet and Sheerness-Chatham area, causing the following casualties to naval ratings. killed 107, wounded 86. One civilian was killed and six injured

5. Mr. E. D. Morel was sentenced to six months' imprisonment in the second division under the Defence of the Realm Act, on a charge of inciting Ethel Sidgwick to convey printed matter from the United Kingdom to Switzerland.

— Hostile aeroplanes crossed the South-East coast, and dropped bombs at various places, including the London district. Eleven persons were killed and sixty-two injured

— A hostile submarine appeared off Scarborough and fired thirty rounds, killing three persons and injuring five.

6. The V.C. was awarded to nine officers, non-commissioned officers and men for conspicuous bravery.

7. Resignation of the French Cabinet.

— *The Times* announced that Sir Oswyn A. R. Murray, K.C.B., had been appointed Permanent Secretary to the Admiralty in succession to Sir W. Graham Greene, K.C.B., who had become Secretary of the Ministry of Munitions.

9. Announcement that a distinctive decoration would be conferred on members of the British Expeditionary Force who landed in France during the time up to and including the First Battle of Ypres.

11. The trial was concluded at the Central Criminal Court of Lieut. Malcolm, who was accused of the murder of Anton Baumberg. Baumberg was accused by Lieut. Malcolm of familiarity with his wife, and was shot by Lieut. Malcolm. The jury found the prisoner not guilty.

12. *The Times* announced that Sir W. E. Davidson, K.C.M.G. (Governor of Newfoundland), had been appointed Governor of New South Wales in succession to Sir Gerald Strickland, G.C.M.G.

14. The V.C. was conferred on eleven officers, non-commissioned officers, and men; and a bar to his V.C. was awarded to Capt. N. G. Chavasse, V.C., who had died of wounds on August 10.

15. Russia was proclaimed a Republic by a Manifesto of the Provisional Government.

17 "Summer time" ended at 2 a.m., the clocks being put back one hour

— The King began a tour of the Clyde industrial centres.

20. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir Arthur Yapp, the National Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., as Director of Food Economy

24. The Admiralty announced that one of His Majesty's destroyers had been torpedoed by a German submarine in the approaches to the Channel and had sunk. There were fifty survivors.

— Hostile aeroplanes attacked the South-East coast by moonlight, and dropped bombs at several places, including London, fifteen persons being killed and seventy injured

25. Hostile airships crossed the Yorkshire and Lincolnshire coasts in the early morning. Three women were slightly injured.

— Hostile aeroplanes made another moonlight attack on the South-Eastern counties. One penetrated near London, and dropped two bombs. The total casualties were seven killed and twenty-five injured

28. Hostile aeroplanes attacked the South-East coast, dropping bombs in Suffolk, Essex, and Kent. Two of the aeroplanes were shot down.

29. Hostile aeroplanes attacked London in force, killing eleven persons and injuring eighty-two

30. Hostile aeroplanes again attacked London. In all districts the casualties were nine killed and forty-two injured, only two persons being killed in London. One of the aeroplanes was brought down off Dover.

OCTOBER

1. Hostile aeroplanes attacked London for the third night in succession. The casualties in all districts were ten killed and thirty-eight injured.

2. H M S *Drake*, an armoured cruiser of 14,000 tons, was torpedoed off the north coast of Ireland, one officer and eighteen men being killed.

— Sales began of National War Bonds, of the Bank of England issue

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. C. A. Harris, C.B., C.M.G., C.V.O., to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Newfoundland.

5. *The Times* announced that Sir Arthur Lee had presented the estate of Chequers to be the official country residence of the future Prime Ministers of England.

9. The Rev. H. E. D. Blakiston, D.D., President of Trinity, was nominated Vice-Chancellor of Oxford for the ensuing year.

— The Admiralty gave notice of their intention to take possession of all stocks of rum in bonded warehouses in the United Kingdom.

12 Announcement that Mr Arthur Clavell Salter, K.C., and Mr. Alexander Adair Roche, K.C., had been appointed Justices of the High Court of Justice in place of the late Mr. Justice Low, and of Mr. Justice Ridley who had resigned.

— *The Times* announced that the King had conferred a peerage on the Right Hon. Sir Francis Hopwood, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

13. Announcement that Lieut-General Sir David Henderson, K.C.B., D.S.O., had been deputed to undertake special work, and vacated his seat on the Army Council. Major-General J. M. Salmond was appointed to succeed him as Director-General of Military Aeronautics, with a seat on the Army Council.

— The Board of Trade increased the price of coal at the pit's mouth by 2s. 6d. a ton to meet the cost of the war wage recently granted to the miners.

— The total number of applications for National War Bonds received since October 2 up to this date was 30,816, the amount applied for being 37,991,050*l.*

15. In a libel action brought by the Prime Minister against the Exchange Telegraph Company (Limited), the *Westminster Gazette*, and the *Daily News* (Limited), the defendants apologised and withdrew the statement which they had published, that Mr. Lloyd George had left London when it was known that an air-raid was imminent. They also agreed to indemnify the Prime Minister for the cost of the proceedings.

16. The Admiralty announced that H.M. mine-sweeping sloop *Begonia*, being now considerably overdue, must be considered as lost with all hands, also that H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Champagne* had been torpedoed and sunk with a loss of five officers and fifty-one men.

17. The President of the Portuguese Republic arrived in London.

— *The Times* announced the appointment of Baron Mongheur as Belgian Minister in London, in succession to M. Paul Hymans

18. The K.C.M.G. was conferred on Major-General Sir H. T. Brooking, K.C.B., Indian Army, in recognition of distinguished services in the field.

19. The Queen visited the Equipment and Stores Inspection Division, Royal Dockyard, Woolwich.

— Hostile airships attacked the Eastern and North-Eastern counties, dropping bombs at various places, including the London area; four of these Zeppelins were brought down during their return.

— H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Orama* was torpedoed and sunk, without casualties

20. Dr G. H. Bishop was sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment without hard labour, for giving pills to a man to affect his heart, and enable him to avoid military service

22. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir Boverton Redwood, Bart., as Director of Technical Investigations in the Petroleum Executive.

23 At a bye-election in East Islington, Mr. E. Smallwood (Government) was returned by a majority of 664 over the other two candidates together.

24 Announcement that one of H.M. destroyers had been sunk as the result of a collision.

29. Hostile aeroplanes attempted to raid the South-Eastern counties, but failed to pass the outer defences

30. Major-General L. J. Bols, C.B., D.S.O., was appointed Chief of the General Staff, vice Major-General Sir A. L. Lynden Bell, as from September 16.

— The late Sir Thomas Bland Royden, Bart., Liverpool shipowner, left estate valued at 1,271,354*l.*

— Dr. J. E. Marr, F.R.S., was elected to the Woodwardian Professorship of Geology in the University of Cambridge.

31. Hostile aircraft crossed the South-East coast, and some of them penetrated into London. The total casualties were eight killed and twenty-one injured.

— Dr. Ross Sinclair, who had been a member of the Whitehall Medical Board, was acquitted at the Central Criminal Court, where he had been charged with conspiring to defeat the provisions of the Military Service Act.

NOVEMBER.

1. Recruiting for the Army passed out of the sphere of the War Office into that of the Ministry of National Service.

— An Order of the Home Secretary came into force, by which all taxi-cab fares in London were raised by 6*d.*

2. At a bye-election at North Salford, Mr. Ben Tillett (Independent) was elected by a majority of 1,277 over Sir C. E. Mallet (Government). Mr. Tillett stood for a vigorous prosecution of the war.

3. *The Times* announced the appointments of Mr. Vaughan Nash, C.V.O., C.B., and Mr. G. M. Young, C.B., as Joint Secretaries to the Ministry of Reconstruction

6. Mr. R. T. Coryndon, C.M.G., Resident Commissioner of Basutoland, was appointed Governor of Uganda in succession to Sir F. J. Jackson, K.C.M.G., C.B.

— Mr. William Moore, K.C., M.P., was appointed one of the Justices of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland.

8. The King approved the award of the V.C. to nine officers and men for conspicuous bravery.

— The Directors of the Bank of England nominated Sir Brien Cokayne, K.B.E., to be Governor, and Mr. Montague Norman, D.S.O., to be Deputy-Governor for the ensuing year.

12. Sir Arthur Yapp, Director of Food Economy, announced a new scale of voluntary rations, in which meat was limited to 2 lb., butter and other fats to 10 oz., sugar to 8 oz., and bread from 8 lb. to 3½ lb. per week, according to sex and occupation (v. English History).

16. Lord Cowdray resigned from the Air Ministry
17. British light forces engaged the light forces of the enemy in the Heligoland Bight.
- The King and Queen visited Whipp's Cross War Hospital, near Epping Forest
18. One of H.M. patrol vessels was torpedoed by an enemy submarine in the Mediterranean, four officers and five men being killed.
19. The Food Controller fixed profits on the sale of bacon, ham, and lard, which had become very dear.
20. A conference was held at 10 Downing Street between the War Cabinet, the heads of the chief Government Departments concerned, and certain members of the Mission from the United States of America, which was in England. The conference was for the purpose of discussing how the United States could best work with Great Britain and its Allies
- A small fire at a munitions works in the North Midlands resulted in the loss of three lives.
21. *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached the figure of 8,000,000*l.*
22. M. Poincaré, the French President, telegraphed his congratulations to the King upon the victory at Cambrai.
23. The King conferred an Earldom on Viscount Reading, G.C.B., G.C.V.O., and a Viscountcy on Lord Northcliffe
- The King promoted Lieut-General the Hon. Sir Julian Byng, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., M.V.O., Commanding Third Army, to be General on account of distinguished service in the field.
26. Lord Rothermere was appointed President of the Air Council.
- The King conferred the V.C. on twenty officers, non-commissioned officers, and men.
28. *The Times* announced that the Ministry of Munitions had appointed Mr. J. C. Wedgwood, D.S.O., M.P., to be an Assistant-Director in the Trench Warfare Department, and the Duke of Westminster, G.C.V.O., D.S.O., to be Personal Assistant to the Controller of the Mechanical Warfare Department.
29. An Inter-Allied Conference opened in Paris under the Presidency of M. Clemenceau.
30. *The Times* announced the appointment of a Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. G. N. Barnes, M.P., to deal with questions of wages, and to co-ordinate the settlement of labour questions affecting Government Departments.
- During November the number of prisoners taken by the British Armies in all theatres of war amounted to 26,869 and 221 guns.

DECEMBER.

3. Four prisoners of war escaped from Farnborough.
4. The creation of a supreme Naval Inter-Allied Committee was announced in Paris

5 *The Times* announced that the London and Provincial Bank and the London and South-Western Bank had provisionally agreed to amalgamate as from December 31 under the title of "London, Provincial, and South-Western Bank, Limited."

— Announcement that the Elder-Dempster liner *Apapa*, of 7,832 tons, had been sunk with a loss of seventy-nine lives.

6. Great explosion at Halifax (*v. Canada*).

— An air raid took place over London and the South-Eastern counties in the early morning; in the Metropolitan area three persons were killed and eleven injured.

8 An Army Tank which had been set up in Trafalgar Square for a fortnight and used for collecting subscriptions for War Bonds and War Savings Certificates, was instrumental in raising within the period a total of 3,423,264/-

9. Jerusalem surrendered to Sir Edmund Allenby.

10. Mr. F. W. Pomeroy, A.R.A., sculptor, was elected a Royal Academician.

11. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir Benjamin Johnson as Director-General of the Army Clothing Department, in succession to Lord Rothermere.

— A British airship with a crew of five went on patrol, and did not return. She was believed to have been destroyed by a hostile seaplane in the North Sea.

12. The Very Rev. Herbert Hensley Henson, Dean of Durham, was appointed Bishop of Hereford

— One of His Majesty's destroyers was sunk after a collision, with a loss of two men.

— A British airship was forced to descend in Holland through engine failure.

14 *The Times* announced that an Air Inventions Committee had been set up under the Chairmanship of Mr. Horace Darwin, F.R.S.

15. The Greek newspapers announced the recall of General Sarrail, and the appointment of General Guillaumet as Commander-in-Chief at Salonika.

16. The King approved the award of the G.C.M.G. to General Sir Edmund Allenby, K.C.B.

17. *The Times* announced the appointment of Mr. William Hart Bennett, C.M.G., to be Governor of the Colony of British Honduras, in succession to Sir Wilfred Collet, K.C.M.G.

18. The V.C. was awarded to ten officers, non-commissioned officers and men.

— Hostile aeroplanes crossed the Kent and Essex coast; some of them reached the London district and dropped bombs. In London ten persons were killed and seventy injured. Outside London five persons were injured.

21. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. Henry Gee, D.D., to be Dean of Gloucester.

22 Three British destroyers were mined or torpedoed in foggy weather off the Dutch coast, thirteen officers and 180 men being lost.

— The Admiralty announced that H.M.S *Stephen Furness*, armed boarding steamer, had been torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine in the Irish Channel, six officers and ninety-five men being lost.

— An explosion occurred at a factory in the North of England ; four persons were killed and several injured, and some damage was done to material.

23 An explosion occurred at an explosives factory in Kent, some damage being done but no life lost.

24. A British air-squadron dropped a ton of bombs on Mannheim-on-the-Rhine.

27 Announcement that Vice-Admiral Sir Rosslyn Wemyss, K.C B., C M G, M.V O , had been appointed First Sea Lord, in succession to Admiral Sir John Jellicoe, G C B , O M , G C.V.O The King conferred a peerage on Sir John Jellicoe; and Sir Rosslyn Wemyss was granted the acting rank of Admiral.

28 *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir Howard Frank as Director-General of Lands for the Air Ministry.

31 Mr Bonar Law and Mr Chamberlain arrived in Paris

— The late Mr Thomas Kenyon of Manchester left property of the gross value of £974,923.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE DARDANELLES COMMISSION, DEALING WITH THE ORIGIN AND INCEPTION OF THE ATTACK IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN. (PUBLISHED MARCH 8)

THE report was signed by Lord Cromer as Chairman, and eight of the other nine members of the Commission—Mr. Andrew Fisher, Sir Thomas Mackenzie, Sir Frederick Cawley, M.P., Mr. J. A. Clyde, K.C., M.P., Mr. Stephen Gwynn, M.P., Admiral of the Fleet Sir W H May, Field-Marshal Lord Nicholson, and Lord Justice Pickford. The only member of the Commission who did not sign the Report was Mr. W. F. Roch, M.P., who presented similar views in a separate memorandum. Mr. Fisher and Sir T Mackenzie dissented on certain details.

The general conclusions were as follows.—

- (a) The question of attacking the Dardanelles was, on the invitation of Mr. Churchill, brought under the consideration of the War Council on November 25, 1914, as “the ideal method” for defending Egypt
- (b) It may reasonably be assumed that, inasmuch as all the authorities concerned were, *prima facie*, in favour of a joint naval and military rather than a purely naval attack, such attack, if undertaken at all, would have been of the former rather than of the latter character had not other circumstances led to a modification of the programme.
- (c) The communication from the Russian Government on January 2 introduced a fresh element into the case. The British Government considered that something must be done in response to it, and in this connexion the question of attacking the Dardanelles was again raised. The Secretary of State for War declared that there were no troops immediately available for operations in the East. This statement was accepted by the War Council, who took no steps to satisfy themselves by reports or estimates as to what troops were available then or in the near future. Had this been done we think that it would have been ascertained that sufficient troops would have been available for a joint naval and military operation at an earlier date than was supposed. But this matter was not adequately investigated by the War Council. Thus the question before the War Council on January 13 was whether no action of any kind should, for the time being, be undertaken, or whether

- ' action should be taken by the Fleet alone, the Navy being held to be the only force available.
- (d) The political arguments which were adduced to the War Council in favour of prompt and effective action, if such were practicable, were valid and of the highest importance, but the practicability of whatever action was proposed was of equal importance.
- (e) Mr. Churchill appears to have advocated the attack by ships alone before the War Council on a certain amount of half-hearted and hesitating expert opinion, which favoured a tentative or progressive scheme, beginning with an attack upon the outer forts. This attack, if successful, was to be followed by further operations against the main defences of the Narrows. There does not appear to have been direct support or direct opposition from the responsible naval and military advisers, Lord Fisher and Sir James Wolfe Murray, as to the practicability of carrying on the operation as approved by the War Council, viz, "To bombard and take the Gallipoli Peninsula, with Constantinople as its objective"
- (f) The First Sea Lord and Sir Arthur Wilson, who was the only other Naval Adviser present at the War Council, expressed no dissent. Lord Kitchener, who occupied a commanding position at the time the decision was taken, was in favour of the project. Both Lord Fisher and Sir Arthur Wilson would have preferred a joint naval and military attack, but they did not express to the War Council and were not asked to express any opinion on the subject, and offered no objection to the naval operations as they considered them experimental and such as could be discontinued if the first results obtained were not satisfactory. Moreover, such objections as they entertained were mainly based on their preference for the adoption of other plans in other theatres of war.
- (g) We think that there was an obligation first on the First Lord, secondly on the Prime Minister, and thirdly on the other Members of the War Council to see that the views of the Naval Advisers were clearly put before the Council; we also think that the Naval Advisers should have expressed their views to the Council, whether asked or not, if they considered that the project which the Council was about to adopt was impracticable from a naval point of view.
- (h) Looking at the position which existed on January 13, we do not think the War Council were justified in coming to a decision without much fuller investigation of the proposition which had been suggested to them that "the Admiralty should prepare for a naval expedition in February to bombard and take the Gallipoli Peninsula with Constantinople as its objective" We do not consider that the urgency was such as to preclude a short adjournment to enable the Naval and Military Advisers of the Government to make a thorough examination of the question.

We hold that the possibility of making a surprise amphibious attack on the Gallipoli Peninsula offered such great military and political advantages that it was mistaken and ill-advised to sacrifice this possibility by hastily deciding to undertake a purely naval attack which from its nature could not attain completely the objects set out in the terms of the decision.

- (i) We are led to the conclusion that the decision taken on February 16 to mass troops in the neighbourhood of the Dardanelles marked a very critical stage of the whole operation. It ought to have been clear at the time that, when this was once done, although the troops might not have been actually landed, it would become apparent to all the world that a really serious attack was intended, and that withdrawal could no longer be effected without running a serious risk of loss of prestige. We consider that at that moment, inasmuch as time was all-important, no compromise was possible between making an immediate and vigorous effort to ensure success at the Dardanelles by a joint naval and military occupation, or falling back on the original intention of desisting from the naval attack if the experiences gained during the bombardment were not satisfactory.
- (j) On February 20 Lord Kitchener decided that the 29th Division, part of the troops which by the decision of February 16 were to have been sent to the East, should not be sent at that time, and Colonel Fitzgerald by his order instructed the Director of Naval Transports that the transports for that division and the rest of the Expeditionary Force would not be required. This was done without informing the First Lord, and the dispatch of the troops was thus delayed for three weeks. This delay gravely compromised the probability of success of the original attack made by the land forces, and materially increased the difficulties encountered in the final attack some months later.
- (k) We consider that, in view of the opinions expressed by the naval and military authorities on the spot, the decision to abandon the naval attack after the bombardment of March 18 was inevitable.
- (l) There was no meeting of the War Council between March 19 and May 14. Meanwhile important land operations were undertaken. We think that before such operations were commenced the War Council should have carefully reconsidered the whole position. In our opinion the Prime Minister ought to have summoned a meeting of the War Council for that purpose, and if not summoned, the other members of the War Council should have pressed for such a meeting. We think this was a serious omission.
- (m) We consider that the responsibility of those members of the Cabinet who did not attend the meetings of the War Council was limited to the fact that they delegated their authority to their colleagues who attended those meetings.

- (n) We are of opinion that Lord Kitchener did not sufficiently avail himself of the services of his General Staff, with the result that more work was undertaken by him than was possible for one man to do, and confusion and want of efficiency resulted.
- (o) We are unable to concur in the view set forth by Lord Fisher that it was his duty, if he differed from the Chief of his Department, to maintain silence at the Council or to resign. We think that the adoption of any such principle generally would impair the efficiency of the public service
- (p) We think that, although the main object was not attained, certain important political advantages, upon the nature of which we have already dwelt, were secured by the Dardanelles expedition. Whether those advantages were worth the loss of life and treasure involved is, and must always remain, a matter of opinion.

Appended to the Report are the minutes of dissent by Mr. Fisher, Sir Thomas Mackenzie, and Mr. Roch. Mr Fisher objects to the form of the Report and its suggestion of absence of decision, also to paragraphs (y) and (o), on the position of expert advisers. Dissent to these paragraphs is also expressed by Sir T. Mackenzie, who also takes exception to that part of the Report and conclusions dealing with "The result of the operations"

THE REPORT.

The period covered by the present Report—the period of origin and inception of the Dardanelles Expedition—begins on August 4, 1914, and concludes on March 23, 1915, on which day it was definitely decided to abandon the original idea of a naval attack. As a preliminary to the work of the Commission there was prepared for it a summary of the proceedings of the War Council in so far as they dealt with the Dardanelles expedition. This was done by Sir Maurice Hankey, who was secretary to the Committee of Imperial Defence and subsequently to the War Council. After this essential preliminary, the Commission examined witnesses, all of whom save one occupied official positions. Their evidence was necessarily given in secret, and, "in view of the improbability of the evidence being published at an early date, we have embodied in our Report copious extracts." "On the whole," the Report reads, "we may state with the utmost confidence that we were furnished with all materials necessary to form a correct and deliberate judgment upon the question upon which Parliament had delegated us to express an opinion."

LORD KITCHENER'S DEATH.

Two preliminary observations are made. The first is that in the period under review there was a heavy strain thrown on all the Departments concerned, and, in the absence of complete written records, the recollection of some witnesses may be obscured. Without casting any imputation on the good faith of witnesses, it is conceivable that they

may be to some extent unconsciously influenced by their knowledge of subsequent events

In the second place, we have to remark that the premature and deeply regretted death of Lord Kitchener naturally renders it impossible for us to state, with the same confidence as that which obtains in the case of living witnesses, whether we have faithfully represented the opinions he entertained and the aims which he had in view at different periods of the proceedings. The difficulty is enhanced owing to the strong opinion which Lord Kitchener entertained as to the absolute necessity of maintaining the strictest secrecy in respect to all matters connected with military operations. Sir Maurice Hankey, indeed, stated that some difficulties at times arose owing to Lord Kitchener's unwillingness to impart full information even to the members of the War Council. We have, however, done all that is possible to ascertain both his views and intentions by closely examining such contemporaneous records as exist and by inquiry from those who were associated with him during his life-time. It is, in this connexion, singularly unfortunate that that gallant officer, Colonel Fitzgerald, who was Lord Kitchener's personal military secretary, and who was probably better acquainted with his opinions than any other individual, shared the fate of his distinguished chief. We have not thought that we should be justified, in deference to the consideration which is rightly shown to the memory of the illustrious dead, in abstaining from a complete revelation of the action which Lord Kitchener took during the various phases of the events under consideration, nor have we hesitated to express our views on that action. It is necessary to do justice to the living as well as to the dead. Moreover, it must be steadfastly borne in mind that, at the time when the attack on the Dardanelles was under consideration, Lord Kitchener occupied a position such as has probably never been held by any previous Secretary of State for War. The circumstances of the case cannot be understood unless the nature of his position is fully realised. In this connexion, we may quote the following passage from the evidence given by Mr. Winston Churchill. "Lord Kitchener's personal qualities and position played at this time a very great part in the decision of events. His prestige and authority were immense. He was the sole mouthpiece of War Office opinion in the War Council. Every one had the greatest admiration for his character, and every one felt fortified, amid the terrible and incalculable events of the opening months of the war, by his commanding presence. When he gave a decision it was invariably accepted as final. He was never, to my belief, overruled by the War Council or the Cabinet in any military matter, great or small. No single unit was ever sent or withheld contrary, not merely to his agreement, but to his advice. Scarcely anyone ever ventured to argue with him in Council. Respect for the man, sympathy for him in his immense labours, confidence in his professional judgment, and the belief that he had plans deeper and wider than any we could see, silenced misgivings and disputes, whether in Council or at the War Office. All-powerful, imperturbable, reserved, he dominated absolutely

our counsels at this time. If the course of my observations and the documents it is my duty to lay before you appear to constitute any reflection upon his military policy, I wish here to testify to the overwhelming weight of the burdens laid upon him, to his extraordinary courage and patience in all the difficulties and perplexities through which we were passing, and to his unvarying kindness to me."

Although, however, we have thought that we should be failing in our duty if we did not deal fully with the part Lord Kitchener played in these transactions, we would ask those who may read this report to remember, in justice to his memory, in the first place, that it has not been possible to check his recorded opinions by the light of subsequent explanation, and, secondly, that if, in the eyes of any critics, he may, under circumstances of very great difficulty, be held to have committed some errors of judgment, the fact cannot in any way obscure the very distinguished services which he rendered to his country in other directions.

HIGHER ORGANISATION.

The next two sections of the Report are together voluminous. They deal with the higher organisation before the outbreak of war and the higher organisation adopted subsequently. Before the war, and until nearly the end of November, 1914, the higher direction of military and naval operations was vested in the Cabinet, who were assisted by the Committee of Imperial Defence. The Committee of Imperial Defence was, for all practical purposes, a Committee of the Cabinet, with some experts added.

In explaining the functions of the Committee of Imperial Defence, Sir Maurice Hankey said that they had been "laid down in time of peace, and with a view to peace requirements." The natural result ensued. Very shortly after the outbreak of war, the Committee, although never formally abolished, fell into abeyance. Another institution was substituted in its place. It appears to us that a body such as the Committee of Imperial Defence, whose sole duty it is to prepare for war, should be organised to meet the requirements not of peace, but of war. We should add that the reason which dictated the transformation of the Committee of Imperial Defence was based, not so much on any defect inherent in that institution itself, but rather on the proved necessity of curtailing the number of members of the Cabinet who actually participated in the conduct of the war.

FORMATION OF WAR COUNCIL.

The Report then explains how and why the War Council was formed on November 25, 1914. The old machinery consisted of the Cabinet, assisted by the Committee of Imperial Defence, with the War Office and Admiralty acting as executive agents.

The Cabinet at that time consisted of twenty-two members. It must have been obvious from the first that it was far too numerous to control effectively the conduct of the war, more especially by reason of the fact

that many of the Ministers presided over Departments which, in some cases, were very slightly and, in others, were in no degree concerned with war-like operations. It is to be regretted that this rudimentary fact was not recognised immediately after the outbreak of war. Thus, for four months, during which time events of the utmost importance were occurring, the machinery employed for designing and controlling the higher operations of the war was both clumsy and inefficient. Eventually some improvement was effected. The War Council took the place of the Committee of Imperial Defence.

The composition and functions of the War Council did not materially differ from those of the Committee of Imperial Defence. . . .

The main change which was effected was, however, in connexion with the powers of the Council as compared to those of the Committee of Imperial Defence. Whilst the latter body was in existence, the responsibility for all important decisions remained, theoretically in all, and practically in most cases, with the united Cabinet. The War Council remained, like the Committee of Imperial Defence, a Committee of the Cabinet with some experts added. Theoretically, the powers of the united Cabinet remained the same as before. Practically, they underwent a radical change. It was the Council, and not the united Cabinet, which finally decided the most important matters, and gave effect to its decisions without necessarily waiting for any expression of assent or dissent from the Cabinet. The Cabinet appear to have been generally informed of any important decisions which may have been taken by the Council, but not until after the necessary executive steps had been taken to give whole or partial effect to those decisions. This is what actually happened in the case both of the naval and military operations undertaken at the Dardanelles. Further, we have been given to understand that some members of the Cabinet did not wish to be informed of what was going on. . . . For all practical purposes it may be held that, during the period under review, the powers and prerogatives of the united Cabinet were, in so far as the conduct of the war was concerned, held almost entirely in abeyance.

On the question of the weight of responsibility resting on different members of the Cabinet, the Report says.—

A distinction has to be made between the real responsibility which devolved on the several Cabinet Ministers who were members of the War Council. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd George), the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward, now Viscount Grey of Fallodon), and the Secretary of State for India (the Marquis of Crewe) exercised undoubted and very legitimate influence, and occasionally stated their opinions, but the main responsibility rested on three members of the Council—namely, the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for War (Lord Kitchener), and the First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Winston Churchill). The latter, in the course of his evidence said “In the early stages the war was carried on by the Prime Minister, and Lord Kitchener, and me, I think, in the next place, but I was on rather a different plane. I had not the same weight or authority as those two Ministers, nor the same power, and if they said, This is to be done

or not to be done, that settled it." We believe this description of the actual working of the machine to be substantially correct (Mr. Asquith, however, said that Mr. Churchill's statement required modification), save that Mr. Winston Churchill probably assigned to himself a more unobtrusive part than that which he actually played.

The main questions which came under the consideration of the War Council in connexion with the Dardanelles were of a highly technical nature, on which the opinions only of those possessed of naval and military knowledge or experience would be of any real value. Therefore, says the Commission, it is essential to ascertain what was the precise position assigned to the expert members of the Council. They considered that the best plan was to quote passages from the evidence of the experts and of the Ministers who were members of the Council. This they do *in extenso*, in the case of the Admiralty. The difficulty did not arise in the case of the War Office, as the War Secretary, Lord Kitchener, was himself a distinguished expert. The case of the Admiralty was different. The First Lord, Mr. Churchill, was not himself an expert. Expert naval advice was represented by Lord Fisher (the First Sea Lord) and by Admiral Sir Arthur Wilson. On one important occasion (January 28) Sir Henry Oliver was also present.

The view taken by Lord Fisher of his own position at the War Council may be gathered from the following extract from his evidence.—

"*The Chairman.* I should like you to explain why you thought that at the War Council there were only two alternatives before you, one to yield your opinion absolutely and the other to resign. You were a consultative body. Is it possible to carry on business with a consultative body on such a basis as that?—*A.* I can make it clear to you. The War Council only consisted of the Cabinet Ministers. We were not members of the War Council. I was not a member of the War Council, nor was Sir Arthur Wilson, nor Sir James Wolfe Murray (the Chief of the Imperial General Staff). It is a mistake to call us members of the War Council—it was no such thing. We were the experts there who were to open our mouths when told to.

"*Q.* Nothing else?—*A.* Nothing else.

"*Q.* And you did not consider yourselves members of the War Council?—*A.* Absolutely not. The members of the Cabinet were members of the Council, and the others were simply there ready to answer questions if asked.

"*Q.* And they never were asked?—*A.* They were sometimes, because I was asked how many battleships would be lost, and I said twelve.

"*Q.* But they were never asked anything about the Dardanelles?—*A. No*"

Sir Arthur Wilson's evidence shows that the view which he took of his position was generally identical with that entertained by Lord Fisher. Generally, the civil members of the War Council—Mr. Winston Churchill, Lord Grey, Mr. Balfour, Lord Haldane, Lord Crewe, and Mr. Lloyd George—dissented from this view. Mr. Balfour made this quali-

fication. He thought the task of the experts ought to be facilitated by the Cabinet Ministers present, the heads of their Departments or the Cabinet Minister in the chair, asking them. Lord Crewe, in his evidence, said that the political members of the Committee did too much of the talking, and the expert members, as a rule, too little. Sir Maurice Hankey took the Ministerial view.

Of the procedure of the War Council the Report draws attention to the fact that the evidence as to whether the decisions were read out or understood is contradictory. Of one important meeting, January 13, Sir Arthur Wilson says: "I was under the impression that no decision had been taken at all." Sir James Wolfe Murray says. "I sometimes left the War Council with a very indistinct idea of any decision being arrived at at all."

Speaking of the meeting of January 13, Lord Fisher said. 'I have not the least doubt a decision was come to, because very likely the Prime Minister went and wrote it down when the meeting was over, but it was never read out to us that that was the decision.'

"Q. You were not aware that any decision was come to?—A. No, I do not remember it; no more does Wilson."

On the other hand, Mr. Asquith states very positively that the decision taken on January 13 was read out before the Council broke up, although possibly some of the members may have left before this was done. Mr. Asquith's description of what occurred is confirmed by Sir Maurice Hankey.

The following are the conclusions to be drawn from the evidence which we have received as to the proceedings of the War Council:—

1. It was not the practice to ask the experts attending the Council to express their opinions
2. The experts themselves did not consider it their duty either to express any opinions unless they were asked to do so, or to intimate dissent at the Council Board, if they disagreed with the views set forth by the Ministers in charge of their respective Departments.
3. The Chairman and the Ministerial members of the War Council looked to the naval and military experts to express their opinions if they dissented from the views put forward by the heads of their respective Departments. As the experts did not express their opinions, the Council was in technical matters guided wholly by the views laid before them by the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty.
4. The functions of the experts were, to a great extent, differently understood by the experts themselves and the Ministerial members of the Council.

ADMIRALTY AND WAR OFFICE.

In addition to the changes in the Committee of Imperial Defence the war brought also important alterations in the methods of conducting business at the Admiralty and the War Office. Immediately after

the outbreak of war, while Prince Louis was still First Sea Lord, a War Staff Group was formed at the Admiralty, which, at Lord Fisher's instance, was "greatly strengthened" in November, 1914. It consisted of the First Lord, the First Sea Lord, the Chief of the Staff (Admiral Oliver), Admiral Sir Arthur Wilson, the Secretary of the Board (Sir Graham Greene), and the Naval Secretary (Commodore de Bartolomé). The Second Sea Lord, who was previously included in the War Staff Group, ceased to be a member. The creation of the Group tended to diminish the authority and to minimise the collective activity of the Board of Admiralty.

The Report proceeds:—

There can, indeed, be no doubt that, at the commencement of the war, the Junior Sea Lords resented the position in which they were placed. None of them were consulted about the Dardanelles Expedition.

The Second Sea Lord, Sir Frederick Hamilton, though generally of opinion that the Board of Admiralty had "a right to give their views on large matters of policy," did not complain of the treatment the Board received in the special case of the Dardanelles. He considered that that was "a matter for the Cabinet to decide." The Third Sea Lord (Rear-Admiral Tudor) said that the only opportunity he had of expressing an opinion on the subject was in the course of an informal conversation with Mr. Churchill. He added that his action "was not welcomed and it had no effect."

The Fourth Sea Lord (Commodore Lambert) testified to the fact that the Board had not been consulted about the Dardanelles Expedition, and expressed an opinion that "it would have been a wise and proper subject for the Board's discussion."

On November 22, 1915, the Junior Sea Lords addressed collectively a Minute to the present First Lord (Mr. Arthur Balfour), in which they said "The principle on which the Order in Council is based that the supremacy of the First Lord is complete and unassailable has been pushed too far, and has tended to imperil and at some future time may again tend to imperil national safety

"The present time may not be the proper one for effecting drastic changes, but of this we are certain, it is the proper and opportune moment to again call the attention of the First Lord to these matters, and to express our conviction that had the naval members of the Board been regularly and collectively consulted on large questions of war policy during the progress of the present naval campaign, some at least of the events which the Empire does at this moment deplore so bitterly would not have happened, and that until the authority and responsibility of the Sea Lords is enlarged and defined, there will be no adequate assurance that similar disasters will not recur in the future."

It should be added that in answer to a Minute addressed to him by the Junior Lords on May 18, Mr. Churchill wrote:—

"I agree that the four Sea Lords should be more fully consulted on large questions of war policy as apart from the day-to-day conduct of the War, where action must proceed easily and rapidly. But neither

Prince Louis of Battenberg nor Lord Fisher were in favour of this practice, considering that War plans and War policy lay wholly in the domain of the First Sea Lord, with the First Lord directly over him exercising supreme executive power. It would appear desirable in future that the War situation should be reviewed each week by the naval members of the Board under the Presidency of the First Lord ”

Lord Fisher does not, however, appear to have concurred in this view. In the course of the evidence which he gave before us, he said. “With regard to the other Sea Lords, they were tremendously occupied with their business in providing the *personnel* and stores and other things for the Fleet. I think it would have been a very great pity to have taken them away from their proper duties to have sat round that table.”

It is thus abundantly clear that, although no formal and official change was made, the spirit in which the business of the Admiralty was conducted underwent a great transformation immediately after the outbreak of the war. The Board of Admiralty sank into insignificance, its place being taken by the War Staff Group. The Board was, even to a less extent than previously, able to assume any “collective responsibility” for the general conduct of affairs. The individual members of the Board were not kept well-informed of passing events. They were not consulted before the naval attack on the Dardanelles was made. It is clear that Mr. Asquith was ill-informed as regards the methods under which Admiralty business was conducted when he stated to the Commission that the members of the War Council “were entitled to assume” that any view laid before them by the First Lord of the Admiralty “was the considered opinion of the Board of Admiralty as a whole.”

Speaking of the organisation of the War Office, the Commission arrived at the following conclusions .—

As regards administrative methods, we think it is much to be regretted that the principles of the devolution of authority and responsibility upon which the War Office system was based were ignored by Lord Kitchener. All the evidence laid before us points to the conclusion that Lord Kitchener was not in the habit of consulting his subordinates, that he frequently gave orders over the heads of the Chiefs of Departments, and sometimes without the knowledge of the Chief of the General Staff, and, in fact, that he centralised the whole administration of the War Office in his own hands. Sir James Murray stated that that portion of the Field Service Regulations which deals with the duties of the Chief of the General Staff were “practically non-existent.” On being asked whether he considered that Lord Kitchener centralised too much authority in his own person, he replied, “Yes, I do undoubtedly,” and he added that the excessive centralisation of which he complained “was due not to the system, but to the personality of the individual who was Secretary of State”

General Callwell, the Director of Military operations, stated that “the real reason why the General Staff practically ceased to exist was because it was not consulted.” He added that, so far as he was aware, Lord Kitchener never “conferred with any one very much.” General

Callwell considered that the extreme centralisation practised "did not tend to the smooth working of the machine."

At a later period of the war, an Order in Council was issued restoring the power of the Chief of the Imperial General Staff which had been allowed to lapse. Sir Reginald Brade, on being asked why this Order was issued, replied "I think the idea was that Lord Kitchener was in the habit of sending on his own orders in regard to operations, and that he did not ask, or disregarded, the advice of the officers of the General Staff. I think that was the object of it. I do not say that was the fact, but that was understood to be what happened—why that Order in Council was passed."

There can, in fact, be no doubt that the principle of centralisation was pushed to an extreme point by Lord Kitchener. It proved eminently successful during the minor operations in the Sudan, which he conducted with conspicuous skill. But it was unsuitable to a stronger force than that which Lord Kitchener commanded in the Sudan or to operations on so large a scale as those in which this country has recently been engaged. Its result was to throw on the hands of one man an amount of work with which no individual, however capable, could hope to cope successfully.

NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

The fourth section of the Report is a narrative of events with comments. It has long been recognised by the naval and military authorities that any attack on the Dardanelles would be an operation of great difficulty. As recently as 1906, in a memorandum prepared by the General Staff, the following passage occurs —

"Military opinion, looking at the question from the point of view of coast defence, will be in entire agreement with the naval view that unaided action by the Fleet, bearing in mind the risks involved, is much to be deprecated."

On October 31, Turkey declared war. On November 3 the outer forts of the Dardanelles were bombarded for about ten minutes. Sir Henry Jackson has expressed the opinion, with which the Commissioners concur, that this bombardment was a mistake, as it was calculated to put the enemy on the alert. The narrative proceeds —

On November 25 the idea of making a serious attack on the Dardanelles was discussed at a meeting of the War Council. Mr. Churchill said that the best way to defend Egypt was to make an attack on some part of the coast of Asiatic Turkey, and, as an extension of this idea, he suggested an attack on the Gallipoli Peninsula, which, if successful, would give us the control of the Dardanelles and enable us to dictate terms at Constantinople. He added that this would be a very difficult operation and would require a large force. Lord Kitchener agreed that it might become necessary to make a diversion by an attack on the Turkish communications, but considered that the moment had not yet arrived for doing so.

A proposal to collect transport, horse-boats, etc., at some British port in the Mediterranean was also discussed. The idea at the time

was that a feint attack might be made on the Gallipoli Peninsula, in order to convey the impression that a landing was intended there, whereas the real point of attack would be made at some other point on the Turkish coast. This proposal was rejected owing to the shortage of tonnage for mercantile purposes, due partly to military demands. It was thought undesirable to aggravate this evil. Nevertheless, on November 30, Vice-Admiral Sir Henry Oliver, the Chief of the Staff at the Admiralty, again proposed that transport should be collected in Egypt sufficient to convey one division. Mr Churchill passed this suggestion on to the War Office, adding that he thought transport should be collected, or kept in readiness at short notice sufficient to convey 40,000 men. Lord Kitchener at once replied "I will give the Admiralty full notice. I do not think transports need be detained in Egypt yet." On receipt of this reply, Mr Churchill "put the project on one side and thought no more of it for the time." Nevertheless, horse-boats continued to be dispatched to Alexandria whenever the occasion was offered, "in case the War Office should, at a later stage, wish to undertake a joint naval and military operation in the Eastern Mediterranean."

On January 2, 1915, a very important telegram, which materially affected the situation, was received from the Ambassador at Petrograd. It was represented that the Russians were hard pressed in the Caucasus, and a hope was expressed that a demonstration against the Turks would be made in some other quarter. On the following day a reply was sent from the Foreign Office, but drafted at the War Office, that a demonstration would be made against the Turks, but stating that it was feared that any such action would be unlikely seriously to affect the withdrawal of enemy troops in the Caucasus. Mr Churchill thinks that Lord Kitchener's reply was the outcome of a conversation he had with him. On January 2 Mr. Churchill received the following private letter from Lord Kitchener —

"I do not see that we can do anything that will seriously help the Russians in the Caucasus. The Turks are evidently withdrawing most of their troops from Adrianople and using them to reinforce their army against Russia, probably sending them by the Black Sea . . . We have no troops to land anywhere . . . The only place that a demonstration might have some effect in stopping reinforcements going East would be the Dardanelles. We shall not be ready for anything big for some months."

Here the Commissioners interrupt the thread of the narrative to inquire who was primarily responsible for originating the proposal to make a purely naval attack on the Dardanelles.

In considering this question, it has to be remembered that Mr Churchill himself, in common with all the experts who were consulted at the time, as well as those who gave their opinions subsequently, was greatly in favour of a joint naval and military attack rather than one conducted by ships alone. Lord Fisher, in giving his evidence, spoke of the "purely naval operation at the Dardanelles" as "Lord Kitchener's proposal," and condemned it in strong terms. He based this opinion

on Lord Kitchener's letter to Mr. Churchill of January 2, quoted in the preceding paragraph. We are unable to concur in Lord Fisher's view. Lord Kitchener suggested and pressed for a demonstration, but that did not necessarily involve a deliberate attempt to force a passage. The proper conclusion seems to be that when a demonstration appeared to be necessary the First Lord thought it was possible to convert and extend that demonstration into an attempt to force a passage, and took the steps which are detailed in the immediately succeeding paragraph.

On a review of the whole of the evidence on this point, a fairly safe conjecture may be made of what was passing through Lord Kitchener's mind early in January. It has to be borne in mind that the question which both Lord Kitchener and the Government generally had to decide was not whether the attack on the Dardanelles should be amphibious or purely naval, but whether, owing to the impossibility of supplying an adequate military force (Lord Kitchener estimated, on January 13, that 150,000 men would be required), any attack at all should be undertaken, or whether, on the other hand, the operation should be limited to a mere demonstration. Lord Kitchener was, without doubt, strongly impressed with both the military and political necessity of acting on the appeal made by the Russian Government. The new army he was creating was not yet ready. He had to provide for home defence, to which he attached the utmost importance. He was most unwilling to withdraw a single man from France. The views entertained by Mr. Churchill at the time as to the prospects of success of a purely naval operation, were, as we shall presently show, somewhat more optimistic than was warranted by the opinions of the experts. Under these circumstances, Lord Kitchener grasped, perhaps rather too eagerly, at the proposal to act through the agency of the Fleet alone, though he recognised the objections to any such undertaking, but it cannot with justice or accuracy be said that the responsibility for proposing the adoption of this course rested with him. It rested rather on the First Lord.

The Report then resumes the narrative of events.—

On January 3, 1915, the following telegram was dispatched from the Admiralty to Vice-Admiral Carden.—

“Do you think that it is a practicable operation to force the Dardanelles by the use of ships alone? It is assumed that older battleships would be employed, that they would be furnished with mine sweepers, and that they would be preceded by colliers or other merchant vessels as sweepers and bumpers. The importance of the results would justify severe loss. Let me know what your views are.”

On January 5, Vice-Admiral Carden replied to the Admiralty telegram of the 3rd, in the following terms—

“I do not think that the Dardanelles can be rushed, but they might be forced by extended operations with a large number of ships.”

In the course of the evidence given before us, Vice-Admiral Carden was asked to explain more fully what he meant by saying that the Dardanelles “might be forced.” In reply, he stated: “I did not mean distinctly that they could be forced. I had it in my mind that it was

impossible to form a real opinion on the subject until one had destroyed the outer forts at the entrance, and was able to get inside and actually find out the extent of the gun defences, of the mine field, and the extent of the movable armament on both sides of the Straits." It is to be observed, however, that no reservation of this sort was made in the telegram sent to the Admiralty on January 5.

On January 6 the following telegram was sent from the First Lord to Vice-Admiral Carden —

"High authorities here concur in your opinion.

"Forward detailed particulars showing what force would be required for extended operations. How do you think it should be employed, and what results could be gained?"

The wording of this telegram is certainly open to criticism. We shall deal presently with the views entertained by the various authorities at the Admiralty. Here we need only remark that at the time Lord Fisher was by far the highest naval authority at the Admiralty, and that, in the absence of any explicit statement to the contrary, Vice-Admiral Carden would naturally suppose that he was included amongst those who concurred in the views set forth in his telegram of January 5. This, in fact, is what actually happened. Vice-Admiral Carden, on being asked "What high authorities did you think were meant?" replied "Well, I knew that Lord Fisher was there and Sir Henry Jackson. I thought it was either or both of them." Now, Lord Fisher agreed with the telegram to Vice-Admiral Carden of January 3, but he does not think he was shown the telegram of the 6th before it was sent. "I think," he said in his evidence, "that I should have objected to that, and asked him (Mr. Churchill) to word it in some other way. Naturally, Carden would think I was in it, would he not?" Mr. Churchill, on the other hand, did not wish it to be inferred that Lord Fisher was included amongst the "high authorities." "I do not," he said, "think it would have been fair to include Lord Fisher then." As regards Sir Henry Jackson, to whose supposed concurrence Vice-Admiral Carden alluded in his evidence, he stated to the Commission that he could not remember whether he was or was not consulted before the telegram of January 6 was dispatched. But Mr. Churchill, in reply to a question put to him by Mr. Clyde, stated that when he spoke of "high authorities" he meant only Sir Henry Jackson and Admiral Oliver, both of whom had expressed their opinions to him verbally.

On January 3, simultaneously with the dispatch of the telegram to Vice-Admiral Carden, Mr. Churchill requested Sir Henry Jackson to prepare a memorandum on the project, which Sir Henry Jackson described as a "note on forcing the Passages of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus by the Allied Fleets in order to destroy the Turko-German squadron and threaten Constantinople without military co-operation." On January 5, Sir Henry Jackson wrote a memorandum, which was not, however, received by Mr. Churchill till some time after the dispatch of the telegram of the 6th to Vice-Admiral Carden. In this memorandum, Sir Henry Jackson did not pronounce any definite opinion either for or against the attack on the Dardanelles. He only

dwell~~on~~ on the minimum force required to undertake the operation, on the losses which would probably be involved in any attempt to "reach the Straits," to which he was strongly opposed, and on the necessity of providing a large supply of ammunition.

On January 11, Vice-Admiral Carden replied to the telegram sent to him from the Admiralty on the 6th. Four operations, he said, were possible. These were:—

- (a) The destruction of defences at the entrance to the Dardanelles
- (b) Action inside the Straits, so as to clear the defences up to and including Cephez Point battery N 8.
- (c) Destruction of defences of the Narrows
- (d) Sweeping of a clear channel through the mine-field and advance through the Narrows, followed by a reduction of the forts further up, and advance into the Sea of Marmora.

He estimated that it would take a month to carry out all these operations.

This telegram, Mr Churchill informed us, "made a great impression on every one who saw it. It was in its details an entirely novel proposition." We understand that the novelty of the proposition consisted in the abandonment of any attempt to rush the Dardanelles, and in the substitution in its place of a scheme by which the forts would be methodically attacked and destroyed one by one. "That, of course," Mr Churchill said, "squared with the impression produced in many people's minds by the destruction of the strong forts on land by the German heavy artillery."

On January 15, Sir Henry Jackson recorded his opinion on Admiral Carden's proposal. His memorandum began with the following remark: "Concur generally in his plans." After dealing at some length with the detailed proposals, Sir Henry Jackson concluded by saying. "I would suggest (a) might be approved at once, as the experience gained would be useful." He did not recommend the undertaking of (c) and (d) unless the experience gained from (a) and (b) justified it. It will be observed that this memorandum is dated January 15, that is to say, two days after the meeting of the War Council on January 13, to which we shall presently allude.

Sir Henry Jackson insisted strongly in the evidence which he gave before us that, in writing his memorandum of January 15, he agreed to an attack on the outer forts and nothing more. He did not consider that an attempt made by the Fleet alone to get through the Dardanelles was "a feasible operation." He thought that "it would be a mad thing to do." He denied the accuracy of the statement made by Mr. Churchill that he, Sir Henry Oliver, and Vice-Admiral Carden "were all agreed." He thought that Mr Churchill was "very much more sanguine" than they were. But nothing of this sort was put on record at the time. The concurrence expressed by Sir Henry Jackson in his memorandum of January 15 with the whole of Vice-Admiral Carden's plans is unqualified save by the expression of an opinion that only the first item of the programme, viz., that which involved the destruction of the outer forts, should be approved at once, with a view to gaining experience.

The explanation of Sir Henry Jackson's reticent attitude is probably to be found in the answer which he gave to a question addressed to him by Mr Fisher to the effect that it was not part of his duty to "unduly interfere with the naval policy except if he were invited to do so by some superior." He also said in the course of his evidence. "It was not for me to decide. I had no responsibilities whatever as to the decision. I had no responsibilities except just for the staff work which I did." He was consulted before the initial telegram of January 3 was sent to Vice-Admiral Carden and expressed his concurrence with its contents

Sir Henry Oliver would greatly have preferred to wait until the army was ready, when a joint naval and military attack might have been made. But he, nevertheless, acquiesced in the naval attack. . . . As regards the other members of the Admiralty staff who were consulted, all would have preferred a joint naval and military attack, but none dissented from the bombardment of the outer forts. Their concurrence was not apparently very cordial, at the same time there can be no doubt that it was given. They were apparently much influenced by the consideration that the matter could be reconsidered after the results of bombarding the outer forts had been ascertained.

WAR COUNCIL—JAN 13.

At the time of the important meeting of the War Council on January 13, the situation was such that the British Government had to consider in what direction a blow could most effectively be delivered to relieve the pressure on Russia and to deter Bulgaria from active adherence to the cause of the Central Powers. For various reasons, all save the proposal to make an attempt on the Dardanelles were rejected. The "advantages were so great that they may possibly have produced a tendency on the part of the members of the War Council to be governed by them to an excessive degree, and to neglect unduly the sole question which was really open to discussion, namely, the advisability of undertaking at that time a purely naval enterprise."

The question (says the Report) was obviously one on which only the opinions expressed by naval and military experts would be of value, and it then proceeds to ascertain how far these expert opinions were expressed. At the meeting Mr. Churchill explained Admiral Carden's plan for demolishing the forts, which he said was based on the fact that the forts were mainly armed by old guns which would be outranged by the guns of the ships. He gave the names of the ships, including the *Queen Elizabeth*, which could be used. He concluded, according to Sir Maurice Hankey's notes of the proceedings :—

"The Admiralty were studying the question, and believed that a plan could be made for systematically reducing all the forts within a few weeks. Once the forts were reduced the mine-fields would be cleared, and the Fleet would proceed up to Constantinople and destroy the *Goeben*. They would have nothing to fear from field guns or rifles, which would be merely an inconvenience"

Sir Maurice Hankey then records —

"Lord Kitchener thought the plan was worth trying. We could leave off the bombardment if it did not prove effective."

Lord Fisher said nothing, but it is essential to inquire fully as to what views he really entertained at this moment. He occupied a position of great responsibility. It is highly probable that if either Lord Kitchener or Lord Fisher had, from the first, expressed, on technical grounds, strong objections to the attack on the Dardanelles, the project would have been abandoned, and it may be regarded as quite certain that, under this hypothesis, the plan would have been much more carefully examined than appears to have been the case . . .

Lord Fisher made a very full statement to us of the views which he entertained. Mr. Churchill also dwelt at length on this subject, and allusion has been made to it by many other witnesses. We think that we can now confidently describe the attitude he assumed both on January 13 and at later periods. It is certain that Lord Fisher did not underrate the importance of the Dardanelles enterprise. On January 3, in a "private and personal" letter to Mr. Churchill, Lord Fisher said: "I consider the attack on Turkey holds the field." He then sketched out the broad outlines of a general plan of operations in the Eastern theatre of war. This plan involved, *inter alia*, the withdrawal of a considerable force from France, and was, therefore, at all events for the time being, incapable of execution. Lord Fisher, in fact, like all other experts, both naval and military, was in favour of a combined attack, but not of action by the Fleet alone. It is certain that, from the very first, he disliked the purely naval operation, but it is especially to be observed that his main objection was not based upon the impracticability of the scheme, considered on its own merits, but on the strong opinion which he entertained that the British Fleet could be better employed elsewhere. All the evidence we have received, including that of Lord Fisher himself, tends to confirm the perfect accuracy of the following statement made to us by Mr. Asquith:—

"As I understand, because I had frequent conversations with him, Lord Fisher's objection to the Dardanelles operations was not so much a technical objection upon naval grounds. It is quite true that, I think throughout, he thought the best chance of success for such an operation would have been a combined operation in which both the land and sea forces were engaged, but Lord Fisher's main objection, at least the one he always impressed on me, was not based in any degree upon the technical or naval merits or demerits of the Dardanelles operations, but upon the fact that he preferred another objective. . . . So far as I understood, from all the conversations I had with him, it was much more upon that ground than upon any specific objection on what you may call technical naval grounds that he was opposed to it."

We have already mentioned that in our present Report we propose only to deal with events which occurred up to March 23, but it may be advisable so far to forestall the contents of our future Report as to say that throughout the whole of the proceedings Lord Fisher consistently maintained the attitude described in the above extract from Mr. Asquith's evidence. He reluctantly acquiesced in the Dardanelles

operations so long as he thought they would not seriously interfere with the plans which he wished to carry into execution elsewhere. But when in the month of May he became convinced that the demands made on the Fleet for action in the Dardanelles would prejudice his alternative schemes, he resigned his post at the Admiralty. It should be clearly understood that his resignation was due solely to this cause and not to objections he entertained to the original scheme for attacking the Dardanelles considered exclusively on its own merits.

Mr Churchill said his impression was that in what he said at the meeting of January 13, he carried with him the full agreement of those who were there. The Report says that it is perhaps overstating the case to say that Lord Fisher was in "full agreement," but at the same time points out the following facts:—

On January 12, Lord Fisher initialled and passed on to the Chief of the Staff the following Minute, which had been written by the First Lord "Secret. Minute by the First Lord to Secretary, First Sea Lord, Chief of Staff. The forcing of the Dardanelles as proposed and the arrival of a squadron strong enough to defeat the Turkish Fleet in the Sea of Marmora would be victory of first importance and change to our advantage the whole situation of the war in the East. It would appear possible to provide the force required by Admiral Carden without weakening the margin necessary in home waters, as follows." The details connected with the proposed movements of ships were then given. Moreover, on January 14, Lord Fisher concurred with a memorandum which was sent from the First Lord to the Prime Minister in which the following passage occurs: "The attack on the Dardanelles will require practically our whole available margin. If that attack opens prosperously it will very soon attract to itself the whole attention of the Eastern theatre, and if it succeeds it will produce results which will undoubtedly influence every Mediterranean Power. In these circumstances we strongly advise . . . that we should devote ourselves to action in accordance with the third conclusion of the War Council, viz., the methodical forcing of the Dardanelles."

The actual decision arrived at by the War Council on January 13, after hearing the views expressed by Lord Kitchener and Mr. Churchill—Lord Fisher, Sir Arthur Wilson, and Sir James Murray remaining silent—was couched in the following terms:—

"The Admiralty should prepare for a naval expedition in February to bombard and take the Gallipoli Peninsula, with Constantinople as its objective."

It is impossible to read all the evidence, or to study the voluminous papers which have been submitted to us, without being struck with the atmosphere of vagueness and want of precision which seems to have characterised the proceedings of the War Council. We have already mentioned that some of those present at the meetings of the Council left without having any very clear idea of what had or had not been decided. The decision of the Council, taken on January 13, is another case in point. The Admiralty was to "prepare" for a naval expedition, and nothing more. It would naturally be inferred from the wording of the

decision that the matter was to be reconsidered by the Council when the preparations were complete, and after the Admiralty plan was matured. Actual approval of the bombardment was withheld. The following extract from the evidence given by Mr. Asquith will show that this is the way in which he understood the decision:—

“*The Chairman.* Did you understand that it was merely provisional, to prepare, but nothing more? It did not pledge you to anything more?”
—*A.* No.

“*Q.* You did not think it approved it?”
—*A.* No. I think all of us thought this was a very promising operation, and the Admiralty ought to get ready for it

“*Q.* But nothing more?”
—*A.* No, no more than that”

Mr. Churchill apparently considered that the decision of January 13 went further than the approval of mere preparation. . . . The statement made by Lord Crewe probably represents with accuracy the manner in which the decision was generally understood by the members of the Council. “I think,” he said, in answer to a question which was addressed to him, “I should say that it was approved subject to the occurrence of any unforeseen event which might have made it from one point of view unnecessary”

The succeeding paragraphs of the Report deal with the measures taken for co-operation with the French, the opinions expressed by the members of the Council on the political advantages of a purely naval attack, into which the questions of withdrawal and prestige entered, and the effect of modern artillery

WAR COUNCIL—JAN. 28.

Then follows the story of the second important meeting of the War Council on January 28

Shortly after the meeting of January 13, Lord Fisher's attitude underwent some change. The real divergence between his views and those of Mr. Churchill became more apparent than heretofore. The latter thus describes what occurred. “During the weeks that followed I could see that Lord Fisher was increasingly worried about the Dardanelles situation. He reproached himself for having agreed to begin the operation. Now it was going to broaden out into a far larger and far longer undertaking than he had contemplated, his great wish became to put a stop to the whole thing. Although our relations continued to be friendly and pleasant, it was clear to me that there was a change. Although we agreed on every definite practical step that had to be taken, there was a deep difference in our underlying view. He knew that I wanted the Fleet to carry out its plan in its integrity. I knew that he wanted to break off the whole operation and come away. . . .”

These differences eventually culminated in the submission by Lord Fisher direct to the Prime Minister on January 25 of a memorandum setting forth his views. It is an interesting and, in many respects, important paper. But it has no very direct bearing on the immediate subject of our inquiry. . . .

It appears that subsequent to the submission of this memorandum,

Lord Fisher intimated that he did not wish to attend any more meetings of the War Council. The Prime Minister was extremely desirous that Lord Fisher should not absent himself from the meeting which was about to take place. It was arranged, therefore, that, prior to the official meeting on January 28, Lord Fisher and Mr. Churchill should meet in the Prime Minister's room and discuss the matter with him. Save in respect to some points of slight importance as regards the precise language used, the accounts given to us by Mr. Asquith and Lord Fisher, as regards what occurred at this private meeting, tally. Mr. Churchill advocated the attack on the Dardanelles. Lord Fisher spoke in favour of those alternative schemes, which we have not thought it advisable to describe, but to which we have already alluded. He did not criticise the attack on the Gallipoli Peninsula on its own merits. Neither did he mention to the Prime Minister that he had any thought of resigning if his opinions were over-ruled. The Prime Minister, after hearing both sides, expressed his concurrence in Mr. Churchill's views. Immediately afterwards the War Council met at 11.30 a.m.

Sir Maurice Hankey's record of this meeting, in so far as it concerns the subject of our inquiry, is as follows:—

“Mr. Churchill said that he had communicated to the Grand Duke Nicholas and to the French Admiralty the project for a naval attack on the Dardanelles. The Grand Duke had replied with enthusiasm, and believed that this might assist him. The French Admiralty had also sent a favourable reply, and had promised co-operation. Preparations were in hand for commencing about the middle of February. He asked if the War Council attached importance to this operation, which undoubtedly involved some risks.

“Lord Fisher said that he had understood that this question would not be raised to-day. The Prime Minister was well aware of his own views in regard to it.

“The Prime Minister said that, in view of the steps which had already been taken, the question could not well be left in abeyance.

“Lord Kitchener considered the naval attack to be vitally important. If successful, its effect would be equivalent to that of a successful campaign fought with the new armies. One merit of the scheme was that if satisfactory progress was not made, the attack could be broken off.”

Mr. Balfour then dwelt on the advantages which would accrue from a successful attack on the Dardanelles, and concluded by saying that “it was difficult to imagine a more helpful operation.”

“Sir Edward Grey said it would also finally settle the attitude of Bulgaria and the whole of the Balkans.

“Mr. Churchill said that the naval Commander in-Chief of the Mediterranean had expressed his belief that it could be done. He required from three weeks to a month to accomplish it. The necessary ships were already on their way to the Dardanelles.”

It is to be observed that the memorandum addressed by Lord Fisher to the Prime Minister on January 25 was not in the hands of the War Council when this meeting took place, neither were they informed of the conversation between the Prime Minister, Lord Fisher, and Mr. Churchill which immediately preceded the meeting. The result,

coupled with Lord Fisher's silence, was that the members of the War Council, although they may have had some rather vague idea that Lord Fisher was not in agreement with the First Lord, were by no means well-informed of his views. Lord Fisher has explained to us the reasons of his silence. He "did not want to have an altercation with his Chief at the Council" Mr. Churchill, he said, "was my Chief, and it was silence or resignation" When asked what he meant by stating to the Council that "he had understood that the (Dardanelles) question would not be raised to-day," he replied "I thought we would have time to think over it. I did not think that it would be gone on with at the meeting" When Lord Fisher found that he was mistaken in this opinion and that a final decision was at once to be taken, he was greatly dissatisfied He rose from his seat with the intention of going to the room of Mr Bonham Carter, the Prime Minister's Private Secretary, and intimating his intention to resign Lord Kitchener at the same time rose from his seat, and, before Lord Fisher could leave the room, had some private conversation with him at the window He strongly urged Lord Fisher not to resign, and pointed out that he was the only one present who disagreed with the Dardanelles operation Eventually, according to a note Lord Fisher made at the time, the latter "reluctantly gave in to Lord Kitchener's entreaty and resumed his seat"

During all these proceedings, Sir Arthur Wilson, for reasons very analogous to those which inspired Lord Fisher's attitude, remained silent

There was a second meeting of the War Council on January 28, and between the two meetings Mr. Churchill sought an interview with Lord Fisher Mr Churchill says.—

"I strongly urged him to undertake the operation, and he definitely consented to do so I state this positively. We then repaired to the afternoon War Council meeting, Admiral Oliver, the Chief of the Staff, coming with us, and I announced finally on behalf of the Admiralty and with the agreement of Lord Fisher that we had decided to undertake the task with which the War Council had charged us so urgently.

"This I take as the point of final decision. After it, I never looked back. We had left the region of discussion and consultation, of balancings and misgivings. The matter had passed into the domain of action."

Thus the third phase of these transactions was reached. There was no longer, as on January 13, any question of "preparing" for an attack on the Dardanelles. It was finally decided that an attack should be made, by the Fleet alone, with Constantinople as its ultimate objective

We wish to add some comments on these proceedings Both Lord Fisher and Sir Arthur Wilson are distinguished officers who, in the course of their honourable careers, have rendered eminent services to their country We have not the least doubt that the attitude which they adopted at the War Council was dictated by a strong sense of duty.

But we have no hesitation in recording our opinion that it was a mistaken sense of duty. Lord Fisher, indeed, himself recognised that he "stretched loyalty to an extreme pitch." . . . Both of these officers were distinguished experts. They must have been aware that the questions which the Council had to decide were of so technical a nature that none but expert opinion could be of any value, and they must also have been aware that none of the Ministerial members of the Council had any expert naval knowledge. We hold, therefore, that although they were not asked definitely to express their opinions, they should have done so. . . .

On Mr. Churchill's conduct the Commissioners say:—

He ought, instead of urging Lord Fisher, as he seems to have done at the private meeting after luncheon on January 28, to give a silent, but manifestly very reluctant, assent to the undertaking, not merely to have invited Lord Fisher and Sir Arthur Wilson to express their views freely to the Council, but further to have insisted on their doing so, in order that the Ministerial members might be placed in full possession of all the arguments for and against the enterprise. We have not the least doubt that, in speaking at the Council, Mr. Churchill thought that he was correctly representing the collective views of the Admiralty experts. But, without in any way wishing to impugn his good faith, it seems clear that he was carried away by his sanguine temperament and his firm belief in the success of the undertaking which he advocated. Although none of his expert advisers absolutely expressed dissent, all the evidence laid before us leads us to the conclusion that Mr. Churchill had obtained their support to a less extent than he himself imagined.

Further, we are very clearly of opinion that the other members of the Council, and more especially the Chairman, should have encouraged the experts present to give their opinion, and, indeed, should have insisted upon their doing so; and, moreover, that if the latter had expressed any doubts a short adjournment should have taken place, in order to allow the matter to be further considered, possibly by the light of what other experts, not having seats on the Council, might have to say. It was common knowledge that naval opinion generally condemned the attack on forts by ships unaided by any military force. The Prime Minister was himself aware of this fact. Such being the case, it would appear that special care should have been taken to elicit a full expression of the opinions entertained by the experts, and that they should have been urged to state them in their own way. What actually happened was that the stress laid upon the unquestionable advantages which would accrue from success was so great that the disadvantages which would arise in the not improbable case of failure were insufficiently considered.

After the meeting of January 28, the necessity for employing a large military force became daily more apparent. The idea of a purely naval operation was gradually dropped. The prestige argument grew in importance. It does not appear that either the Cabinet or the War Council ever deliberately discussed and deliberately changed the policy.

General Callwell says "We drifted into the big military attack" There appears to be some reason for supposing that Lord Kitchener realised from the first that the aid of the Army would eventually be necessary

On February 16 a very important informal meeting of Ministers was held. Owing to events in Egypt and to changes in plans in the West, it was decided to mass a considerable force in the Mediterranean to be used as occasion might require. The decisions, which were eventually incorporated with those of the War Council, were as follows —

"1. The XXIXth Division, hitherto intended to form part of Sir John French's Army, to be dispatched to Lemnos at the earliest possible date It is hoped that it may be able to sail within nine or ten days

"2. Arrangements to be made for a force to be dispatched from Egypt, if required

"3 The whole of the above forces, in conjunction with the battalions of Royal Marines already dispatched, to be available in case of necessity to support the naval attack on the Dardanelles

"4. Horse-boats to be taken out with the XXIXth Division, and the Admiralty to make arrangements to collect small craft, tugs, and lighters in the Levant

"5 The Admiralty to build special transports and lighters suitable for the conveyance and landing of a force of 50,000 men at any point where they may be required."

Sir Maurice Hankey states that this was "the all-important decision from which sprang the joint naval and military enterprise against the Gallipoli Peninsula" This decision may, in fact, be regarded as the fourth phase of the transactions. It had not been definitely decided to use troops on a large scale, but they were to be massed so as to be in readiness should their assistance be required

LORD KITCHENER'S VIEW.

"Acute discussions" took place at the War Council on February 19 (the day on which the first bombardment took place), February 24 and 26. It was in the course of these days that the views of Lord Kitchener, "who was in reality the leading spirit of the triumvirate which was conducting the war," underwent a considerable change The possibility of breaking off the attack on the Dardanelles had altogether disappeared from the purview of the responsible authorities by the middle of February.

At the meeting on the 24th, Lord Kitchener said that he "felt that if the Fleet would not get through the Straits unaided, the Army ought to see the business through The effect of a defeat in the Orient would be very serious There could be no going back. The publicity of the announcement had committed us." Lord Grey said that "failure would be morally equivalent to a great defeat on land." . . The scope of the intended military operations was left in doubt. Lord Kitchener and others still clung to the idea that success was attainable by naval action alone. In the course of the discussion on February 24, he asked

Mr. Churchill whether he "contemplated a land attack." The latter said, in reply, that "he did not, but it was quite conceivable that the naval attack might be temporarily held up by mines, and some local military operation required." The telegrams sent from the War Office give some indication of what was passing in Lord Kitchener's mind at this time. On February 23 he sent through Sir John Maxwell, who was in Egypt, instructions to General Birdwood, who was about to proceed to the Dardanelles, to report, "whether it is considered by the Admiral that it will be necessary for troops to be employed to take the forts, and, if so, what force will be necessary, whether a landing force will be required of the troops to take the forts in reverse, and generally in what manner it is proposed to employ the troops" On February 24 he telegraphed to Sir John Maxwell: "It is proposed that the Navy should silence the guns and destroy the forts with gun fire It is not intended that parties should be landed on the Gallipoli Peninsula, except under cover of the naval guns, to help in total demolition when the ships get to close quarters" On February 26, Sir John Maxwell telegraphed that the French officer, who had formerly been military attache at Constantinople, thought that "a military expedition is essential for opening the Dardanelles passage to the Allied Fleet, and it would be extremely hazardous to land on the Gallipoli Peninsula, as the peninsula is very strongly organised for defence" On the evening of the same day, Lord Kitchener telegraphed to General Birdwood through Sir John Maxwell: "The forcing of the Dardanelles is being undertaken by the Navy, and as far as can be foreseen at present the task of your troops, until such time as the passage has actually been secured, will be limited to minor operations, such as final destruction of batteries, after they had been silenced, under the covering fire of the battleships. It is possible, however, that howitzer batteries may be concealed inland with which the ships cannot deal effectively, and, if called upon by Admiral Carden, you might have to undertake special minor operations from within the Straits for dealing with these Remember, however, that there are large enemy military forces stationed on both sides of the Straits, and you should not commit yourself to any enterprise of this class without aerial reconnaissance and assurance of ample covering fire by the Fleet. At any time during the bombardment of the Dardanelles you can, of course, apply for and obtain any additional forces from your corps in Egypt that you may require up to the total of its strength."

In the meanwhile, the Admiralty, in accordance with the decision arrived at on February 16, had been preparing transports to convey the XXIXth Division to the Mediterranean. It was calculated that their departure would commence on the 22nd On the 20th, however, Colonel Fitzgerald, Lord Kitchener's Personal Military Secretary, called at the Admiralty and stated that it had been decided that the XXIXth Division were not to go. This decision led to an acute difference of opinion between Lord Kitchener and Mr. Churchill. The discussions on the subject at the meetings of the War Council on February 24 and 26 were animated. Mr. Churchill made "the strongest possible appeal" for the immediate dispatch of the XXIXth Division He formally recorded his dissent at the Division being retained in this country, and added

that he "must disclaim all responsibility if disaster occurred in Turkey owing to the insufficiency of troops." Lord Kitchener, on the other hand, held that the Naval Division and Marines, together with the Australians and New Zealanders, whom it was proposed to bring from Egypt, constituted an adequate force, and that the 33,000 men available from the XXIXth Division and a Territorial Division which it was proposed to send from home would not be likely to make the difference between success and failure. He was also uneasy about the position both in the Western and Russian theatres of war. He therefore declined to yield, and the Council, although Mr. Churchill's views appear to have received some support, finally decided in accordance with Lord Kitchener's advice. It is clear that, at the time of the discussion, Lord Kitchener still thought that the Fleet, unaided, would be able to obtain entrance into the Sea of Marmora. "He felt convinced, from his knowledge of Constantinople and the East, that the whole situation in Constantinople would change the moment the Fleet had secured a passage through the Dardanelles. We should be in a better position to judge the situation when the defences at the Narrows began to collapse."

With the decision finally taken on February 26, the fifth phase in these transactions may be said to have closed. On February 16, it had been decided to employ troops on a large scale. This decision still held good, but its execution was to be delayed. At the same time, the idea of forcing the Dardanelles by the action of the Fleet alone had not been abandoned.

Another meeting of the War Council was held on March 3. By this time Lord Kitchener's opposition to the dispatch of the XXIXth Division had apparently weakened. On the question being raised by Mr. Churchill, he said that "he proposed to leave the question open until March 10, when he hoped to have heard from General Birdwood." General Birdwood, however, arrived at the Dardanelles before the 10th. On the 5th he telegraphed to Lord Kitchener "I am very doubtful if the Navy can force the passage unassisted. In any event the forcing of passage must take a considerable time; the forts that have been taken up to the present have been visible and very easy, as the ships could stand off and shoot from anywhere, but inside the Straits the ships are bothered by unknown fire." This was followed on the 6th by a telegram to the following effect: "I have already informed you that I consider the Admiral's forecast is too sanguine, and though we may have a better estimate by March 12, I doubt his ability to force the passage unaided." On March 10, Lord Kitchener, being then somewhat reassured as regards the position in other theatres of war, and being also possibly impressed by General Birdwood's reports, announced to the War Council that "he felt that the situation was now sufficiently secure to justify the dispatch of the XXIXth Division."

The sixth phase in these transactions was thus reached. The decision of February 16, the execution of which had been suspended on the 20th, again became operative on March 10. In the meanwhile, three weeks of valuable time had been lost. The transports, which might have left on February 22, did not get away till March 16.

It is with great reluctance and hesitation that we comment on these

proceedings, for it is obvious that Lord Kitchener was mainly responsible for the decisions taken during the critical period between February 16 and March 10, and it is quite possible that, were he alive, he might be able to throw a new light upon them. Nevertheless, we think it is incumbent on us to state the conclusions at which, with the evidence before us, we have arrived.

Lord Kitchener's position at this time was one of great difficulty. With the forces at his disposal he had to provide for home defence and also for maintaining an adequate force both in Flanders and Egypt. Was he to add to the demands which he had to meet the further liability of undertaking an additional military operation on a large scale in another and distant theatre of war? It can be no matter for surprise that he hesitated to do so. Subsequent events showed that the fears he entertained for the immediate future were groundless, but to impute any shadow of blame on that account would involve judging by the light of the wisdom which is the product of after-knowledge. Dealing, however, solely with the evidence which was available at the time, it certainly seems strange that the actualities of the situation should not have been more fully realised both by Lord Kitchener and his colleagues. From the moment when large bodies of troops were massed in the immediate neighbourhood of the Dardanelles, even although they were not landed, the situation underwent a material change. Whatever may have been the intentions of the Government, the public opinion of the world must have been led to believe that an intention existed of making a serious attack both by land and sea. The loss-of-prestige argument therefore naturally acquired greater force than had been formerly the case. From the time the decision of February 16 was taken there were really only two alternatives which were thoroughly defensible. One was to accept the view that by reason of our existing commitments elsewhere an adequate force could not be made available for expeditionary action in the Eastern Mediterranean, to face the possible loss of prestige which would have been involved in an acknowledgment of partial failure, and to have fallen back on the original plan of abandoning the naval attack on the Dardanelles, when once it became apparent that military operations on a large scale would be necessary. The other was to have boldly faced the risks which would have been involved elsewhere and at once to have made a determined effort to force the passage of the Dardanelles by a rapid and well-organised combined attack in great strength. Unfortunately, the Government adopted neither of these courses. Time, as Mr. Asquith very truly said to us, was all-important. Yet for at least three weeks the Government vacillated and came to no definite decision in one sense or the other. The natural result ensued. The favourable moment for action was allowed to lapse. Time was given to the Turks, with the help of German officers, to strengthen their position, so that eventually the opposition to be encountered became of a far more formidable character than was originally to have been anticipated. Moreover, even when the decision was taken, it was by no means thorough. As we shall presently show, the hope of dispensing altogether with military assistance, save in respect to what were called "minor operations," was not abandoned. We think that Mr. Churchill was quite justified in

attaching the utmost importance to the delays which occurred in dispatching the XXIXth Division and the Territorial Division from this country

SIR IAN HAMILTON'S APPOINTMENT.

Early in March it was decided to send out Sir Ian Hamilton to command the troops being assembled near the Dardanelles. His instructions and a conversation he had with Lord Kitchener made it clear that the scope of the military operations was not fully decided. The instructions contain the following passage:—

The Fleet has undertaken to force the passage of the Dardanelles. The employment of military forces on any large scale at this juncture is only contemplated in the event of the Fleet failing to get through after every effort has been exhausted

Having entered on the project of forcing the Straits, there can be no idea of abandoning the scheme

Sir Ian Hamilton in his evidence dwelt strongly on the total absence of information furnished to him by the War Office Staff. No preliminary scheme of operations had been drawn up "The Army Council has disappeared." As to the verbal instructions given him by Lord Kitchener, Sir Ian Hamilton gave the following answers:—

"*M_r Roch.* Did you gather from that conversation with Lord Kitchener that he contemplated military operations then?"—*A.* No; he repeatedly said—he broke in talking about landing by saying. 'I do not expect you to do it at all. I hope to get through without it.' He contemplated certainly landing on the Bosphorus.

"*Q.* As far as I gather he contemplated that the Navy would do the forcing of the Straits?"—*A.* Certainly.

"*Q.* And you went out under that impression?"—*A.* Yes, I did entirely.

"*Q.* Until you got the telegram from Lord Kitchener of the 19th March those were the first instructions you received from him that you were to undertake landing operations to take the Peninsula?"—*A.* No doubt in conversation with me Lord Kitchener did contemplate such a thing, except that he insisted I must not do so piecemeal.

"*Q.* You recollect the telegram. 'You know my views that the passage of the Dardanelles must be forced,' and so on—'those operations must be undertaken after careful consideration.' I read those as rather peremptory instructions that you were to take the Peninsula?"—*A.* Undoubtedly.

"*Q.* That is how I read it, and that is the way you read it?"—*A.* Yes. I do not mean to say I had altogether parted with my discretion, and if I had chosen to say, 'This is altogether an impossibility,' I might have said so, but I did not think so."

Important telegrams passed between the First Lord and Admiral Carden between March 10 and 16. Mr. Churchill on March 11 asked whether the time had not arrived when "you will have to press hard for a decision," adding "Every well-conceived action for forcing a

decision, even should regrettable losses be entailed, will receive our support."

In his reply Admiral Carden said :—

I consider stage when vigorous action is necessary for success has now been reached. I am of opinion that in order to ensure my communication line immediately Fleet enters the Sea of Marmora, military operations on a large scale should be opened at once

On March 15 Mr Churchill sent another telegram to Admiral Carden, in which he said —

When General Hamilton arrives on Tuesday night concert with him in any military operations on a large scale which you consider necessary. . . . The XXIXth Division (18,000 additional men) cannot arrive until April 2.

Admiral Carden said he would do so, but on the following day he was obliged to resign for reasons wholly based on the state of his health.

Admiral de Robeck was given the command, and on March 19 he telegraphed that he had that day had a satisfactory interview with Generals Hamilton and D'Amade and Admiral Wemyss. He proposed to proceed with operations on the following day. The following are some of Admiral de Robeck's answers to the Commission —

I think every one thought it better to have a combined operation, but one was not consulted as to whether it was the right way to do it or not—we were told to bombard these forts, so we did it.

"*Mr. Clyde* I think from the first when you went there you rather looked at the matter from the point of view of an Admiralty order to force the Dardanelles, and your job was to do it if you could?"—A Yes, that was our first object. Therefore, the order was to carry out a certain operation or try and do it, and we had to do the best we could."

From these explanations it may be gathered that Admiral de Robeck at the time considered the exclusively naval operation practicable if only the mine-field could be cleared, that his opinion was greatly influenced by political considerations, and particularly by the loss of prestige which would be involved if the attack were abandoned, and that the main reason which dictated the answer sent to the Admiralty questions on March 17 was "the necessity of going on." In fact Admiral de Robeck thought he had orders to force the passage of the Dardanelles, and that it was his duty to do his best to carry out those orders.

The results of the bombardment in which ships were lost and damaged are well known.

On March 19, Sir Ian Hamilton telegraphed to Lord Kitchener : "I have not yet received any report on the naval action, but from what I actually saw of the extraordinarily gallant attempt made yesterday, I am being most reluctantly driven towards the conclusion that the Dardanelles are less likely to be forced by battleships than at one time seemed probable, and that if the Army is to participate its operations will not assume the subsidiary form anticipated.

"The Army's share will not be a case of landing parties for the destruction of forts, etc., but rather a case of a deliberate and progressive military operation carried out in force in order to make good the passage of the Navy." Lord Kitchener at once replied in the following terms "You know my views that the passage of the Dardanelles must be forced, and that if large military operations on the Gallipoli Peninsula by the Army are necessary to clear the way, those operations must be undertaken after careful consideration of the local defences, and must be carried through." We have already mentioned that Sir Ian Hamilton regarded this telegram in the light of a "peremptory instruction that he was to take the Peninsula." We think that he was justified in doing so. On March 22, Sir Ian Hamilton again telegraphed to Lord Kitchener stating that he proposed to go to Alexandria. On March 23, Lord Kitchener telegraphed to Sir Ian Hamilton "I hear that April 14 is considered by you as about the date for commencement of military operations if the Dardanelles have not been forced by the Fleet before that date. I think that you had better know at once that I regard any such postponement as far too long. I should like to know how soon you could act on shore" These telegrams are conclusive proof that Lord Kitchener had by that time wholly abandoned the idea of a purely naval operation, and realised the fact that military operations on a large scale were necessary. The telegrams also prove that Lord Kitchener, in contemplating military action, had no clear idea as to when a landing could be made. As a matter of fact the landing did not take place until April 25.

On March 23, Sir Ian Hamilton telegraphed to Lord Kitchener "I have now conferred with Admiral, and we are equally convinced that to enable the Fleet effectively to force the passage of the Dardanelles the co-operation of the whole military force will be necessary."

The first impression produced by the receipt of the news of the bombardment was that the naval operations should continue in spite of the losses which had been incurred. The following statement in Mr Churchill's narrative shows what happened. "I regarded it as only the first of several days' fighting, though the loss in ships sunk or disabled was unpleasant. It never occurred to me for a moment that we should not go on, within the limits of what we had decided to risk, till we reached a decision one way or the other. I found Lord Fisher and Sir Arthur Wilson in the same mood. . . . The first telegrams received from Admiral de Robeck dated March 19 and 20 clearly indicate that he shared the view entertained at the Admiralty. . . ."

A meeting of the War Council was held on the morning of the 19th, at which it was decided "to inform Vice-Admiral de Robeck that he could continue the naval operations against the Dardanelles if he thought fit." On March 23, however, Admiral de Robeck changed his views. He spoke of the "mine menace" being "much greater than we expected." He said that time would be required for "careful and thorough treatment, both in respect of mines and floating mines." He added. "Time will be required for this, but arrangements can be made by the time the army will be ready. A decisive operation about the middle of next month appears to me better than to take great risks

for what may well be only half measures" He further said. "It does not appear to me practicable to land a sufficient force inside the Dardanelles to carry out this service. This view is shared by General Hamilton."

On the 26th, Admiral de Robeck further telegraphed. "The check on March 18 is not, in my opinion, decisive, but on March 22 I met General Hamilton and heard his views, and I now think that, to obtain important results and to achieve the object of the campaign, a combined operation will be essential." This telegram, Mr. Churchill says, "involved a complete change of plan and was a vital decision. I regretted it very much. I believed then, as I believe now, that we were separated by very little from complete success" The whole question was then discussed at great length at the Admiralty. Mr Churchill records "I proposed that we should direct the Admiral to renew the naval attack, according to his previous intention. The First Sea Lord, however, did not agree; nor did Sir Arthur Wilson, nor did Sir Henry Jackson. Lord Fisher took the line that hitherto he had been willing to carry the enterprise forward, because it was supported and recommended by the Commander on the spot. But now that Admiral de Robeck and Sir Ian Hamilton had decided upon a joint operation, we were bound to accept their view. I do not at all blame Lord Fisher for this decision. The arguments for it were very strong indeed. But so were the arguments against it. Both the Prime Minister and Mr Balfour, with whom I discussed the matter, were inclined to my view, but as our professional advisers and the Admiral on the spot were against it, it was impossible to go further, and I bowed to their decision. But with regret and anxiety."

This was the last phase of the "origin and inception" period. From this time onward two points became perfectly clear. One was that the Government had no intention of abandoning the attack on the Dardanelles; the second was that the attack would be made both by the Navy and by military forces who would be employed on a large scale.

RESULTS OF THE OPERATIONS.

In conclusion, the Commission discuss the results of the operations. The attempt to force the Dardanelles and to reach Constantinople failed, but it would be an exaggeration to say that the expedition, considered as a whole, was a complete failure. It was fairly successful in creating a diversion in favour of Russia, and it can scarcely be doubted that, but for it, Bulgaria would have joined the Central Powers at a much earlier date. The Prime Minister (Mr Asquith) spoke very decisively on these points, as the following extracts from his evidence show. —

"*The Chairman:* In spite of the fact that it was a failure in one sense, do you think it was a success in another, and that if you had not carried out that expedition to the Dardanelles the position of the Allies would have been very much worse than it is now? — *A.* Yes, I am unhesitatingly of that opinion. I say so now, after all the experience we have gained, and after what one must admit to have been the ultimate failure of the expedition. I say deliberately that there is no operation

in the whole of this war which promised better results than the Dardanelles operation. If it had succeeded, and it would have succeeded but for things which in the course of your inquiry you will come across, and no doubt pronounce upon, in my judgment it would have produced a far greater effect upon the whole conduct of the war than anything that has been done in any other sphere of the war

"Q. I think nobody can doubt that for a moment, but it does not go very far. If successful it would have had an enormous effect; but the question I wanted to ask you was this, even as it was, you think the effect was very beneficial?"—A. I do, even though it failed. If you like I will tell you why.

"Q. Yes, please.—A. I will give you two reasons. There are a great many I might give, but I will give two. In the first place, it undoubtedly staved off and postponed for months the adhesion of Bulgaria to the Central Powers. There is no doubt whatever about that. In the second place—and this was the point Lord Kitchener always insisted upon up to the end—he said to me a hundred times it contained and immobilised very nearly 300,000 Turkish soldiers for the best part of nine months, who otherwise would have been a most formidable accretion to the enemy forces. Even though it failed, I consider it had very effective and powerful results."

Lord Grey said that there were certain consequences which would have happened sooner if the expedition had not been going on. He would strongly controvert any statement that the expedition was of no use at all. It was decidedly of use, but it must remain a question of opinion whether it was worth such a tremendous sacrifice of effort.

On these opinions the Commission says—

We are generally in agreement with the views expressed by Mr. Asquith and Lord Grey, but we regard Lord Kitchener's estimate of the number of Turkish troops immobilised for nearly nine months as conjectural.

Finally the Commission quotes opinions on what might have happened if the naval attack on March 18 had not been pressed, including a reported opinion of Enver Pasha, which reads.—

"If the English had only the courage to rush more ships through the Dardanelles they could have got to Constantinople, but their delay enabled us thoroughly to fortify the Peninsula, and in six weeks' time we had taken down there over 200 Austrian Skoda guns."

The narrative concludes.—

Whatever weight may be attached to these opinions and reports it must be remembered that out of the sixteen ships which attacked the Straits on March 18 three were sunk and four were rendered unfit for further immediate action. Had the attack been renewed within a day or two there is no reason to suppose that the proportion of casualties would have been less, and, if so, even had the second attack succeeded, a very weak force would have been left for subsequent naval operations.

Appended to the Report are minutes of dissent of Mr. Andrew Fisher, Sir Thomas Mackenzie, and Mr. W. F. Roch, M.P.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE MESOPOTAMIA COMMISSION,
APPOINTED IN AUGUST, 1916, TO INQUIRE INTO THE OPERA-
TIONS IN MESOPOTAMIA. (PUBLISHED JUNE 26)

THE Commission consisted of Lord George Hamilton, G C S.I. (Chairman), Lord Donoughmore, Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., Admiral Sir Cyprian Bridge, General Sir Neville Lyttelton, Sir Archibald Williamson, M.P., Mr. John Hodge, M.P., and Commander Josiah Wedgwood, M.P. All the Commissioners signed the Report with the exception of Commander Wedgwood, who made a separate report.

INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT.

By way of introduction to their narrative of the campaign the Commission give an account of the physical and climatic peculiarities of Mesopotamia, and of the obstacles which they present to military operations.

Mesopotamia comprises the country between and adjacent to the lower reaches of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, and is a vast, roadless desert, intersected by swamps, and without timber or stone. The few towns are situated on the river banks. The sole access from the sea is by a channel called the Shatt-el-Arab through which the Tigris and Euphrates flow into the Persian Gulf. Seventy miles up this channel is the primitive little port of Basra, which in 1914 was without quays, storehouses, or any of the facilities necessary for the base of an expeditionary force.

Kurna, Amara, Kut, and Baghdad, towns to which the expedition successively advanced, are respectively 50, 140, 290, and 500 miles up river from Basra. Ctesiphon lies between Kut and Baghdad. The navigation of the Tigris is very difficult. Ocean-going steamers, drawing not more than 19 ft., can make their way to Basra, but for 50 miles above Basra, as far as Kurna, the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, there is only 7½ to 12 or more feet of water, according to the season and the floods. From Kurna to Baghdad the river is shallow, and in places very tortuous, so that only steamers of 3½ ft. draught and of special construction can safely make the journey. Floods frequently overflow the banks of the river, and not only increase the difficulty of navigation, but also absolutely prevent marching or wheeled traffic over large tracts of country.

From their consideration of all these difficulties the Commission draw the conclusion that the provision of adequate and suitable river transport above Basra, and of sufficient wharfage and unloading facilities at Basra, was a necessity, if effective military operations were to be carried out inland. "As an expeditionary army must be sea-borne, sea-supported, and sea-victualled, and well supplied with river transport, it was manifest from the outset that without these facilities the orderly dispatch and distribution of the reinforcements, ammunition, stores, and supplies necessary for the well-being and replenishment of an advancing force would be almost impossible. The treacherous climate and the alternation of sweltering heat and bitter cold in these regions made the

continuous supply of such articles as warm clothing, double-fly tents, sun-helmets, spine-pads, goggles, ice, ventilating-fans, mosquito-nets, quinine and other tropical prophylactics indispensable, if the health and *moral* of the troops were to be maintained at their accustomed high standard. Full rations, varied from time to time to counteract the climatic diseases of the country, were very requisite. Sickness, even with a full supply of such palliatives, was certain to be high, necessitating abnormal hospital accommodation in addition to the ordinary provision for military casualties."

Whilst the conditions of the campaign in Mesopotamia required a standard of preparation and equipment above the ordinary, the Indian Army was, on the outbreak of war, not even up to the ordinary standard in these matters. This was due to the campaign of military economy which, by agreement between the Home and Indian Governments, had been pursued in India for many years before the war. The gradual extinction of the opium revenue and the friendly understandings arrived at with Russia were both treated as reasons for a reduction of military establishments. The supply of artillery was cut down both in quantity and quality. The number of troops available for immediate mobilisation was reduced, and the army generally was only equipped for frontier warfare against savage tribes. The Indian Army was, therefore, relatively, as regards mechanical equipment, guns, etc., in a less favourable position to confront modern troops than it was in the time of the South African War; whilst reserves, both of *personnel* and material, had been reduced to a very low ebb when the war broke out.

Moreover, before the expedition to Mesopotamia was dispatched India had already equipped and sent out large expeditions to France and South Africa, and in considering the Indian Government's responsibilities in Mesopotamia, it is fair to remember that the Mesopotamia Expedition was only part of a larger effort which involved not only the maintenance in India of a considerable army for interior and frontier defence, but also the dispatch overseas of troops approximating in number to the total army maintained in India before the war.

ORIGIN OF THE CAMPAIGN.

The Mesopotamia Expedition originated in a minute by General Barrow, the Military Secretary at the India Office, to the Secretary of State for India, dated September 26, 1914, suggesting that a force should be sent from India to occupy Basra in the event of Turkey joining in the war. The advantages of such an expedition were stated by General Barrow to be that it would checkmate Turkish intrigues and demonstrate our ability to strike, it would encourage the Arabs to rally to us, it would safeguard Egypt, for without Arab support a Turkish invasion of Egypt was impossible, and it would effectually protect the oil installation at Abadan, in which the Admiralty had a large interest. The Secretary of State consulted India on the proposal, it appeared that the Germans were sending secret emissaries and German officers to raise a *Jehad* in the countries lying between Mesopotamia and India, and ultimately the Secretary of State ordered the expedition to be dispatched. The pro-

posal seemed sound and justifiable in itself, as it was likely to prove an effective counter to German and Turkish intrigues.

The Commission find that

"The expedition to Mesopotamia was a justifiable military enterprise, but one of such a nature that it required, during its inception and development, the most careful watching and preparation"

It must be explained that the Secretary of State, while retaining control of the policy of the expedition, expressly delegated its management to the Indian Government. Accordingly the Indian Government secretly dispatched from Bombay, early in October, 1914, a Brigade of British and Indian troops under General Delamain, with orders to demonstrate at the head of the Persian Gulf, to occupy Abadan Island with the object of protecting the oil-works, and, if possible to occupy the port of Basra. On November 5 war was declared against Turkey, and the expedition was brought up to the strength of a division (roughly some 15,000 men), and placed in command of Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Barrett, who arrived in Mesopotamia on November 14. After a few successful skirmishes with the enemy Basra was occupied without much difficulty on November 22. "So far the expedition had been a complete success, and in three weeks Basra, the key to Mesopotamia, had been taken and occupied. The suddenness and secrecy of the move had not only ensured success, but it had done so at very small cost to the expedition."

On the suggestion of the Military Secretary at the India Office, Sir Edmund Barrow, permission was given by Lord Ciewe, then Secretary of State for India, for the force to push forward to Kurna, which is 50 miles north of Basra, and was considered a position of commanding military value on account of its situation at the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. Operations against Kurna were successfully concluded on December 9, by the surrender of the town, together with Wadi, 1,200 prisoners and 9 guns.

Our authority was thus established over the whole of the river tract between Kurna and the sea. The interval between December, 1914, and April, 1915, was spent in preparation for defending the British position. The Turks concentrated for an attack on Basra from the north-west, and at the same time threatened the safety of the oil-pipe up the Karun river in the north-east. The situation became acute, and in March and April the expedition was reinforced by a second division, and the whole force placed under the command of General Sir John Nixon, who arrived in Basra on April 9. On April 14, the Turkish threat against Basra was successfully thwarted by a brilliant victory of the British and Indian troops under General Mellis at Barjisyah, near Basra, and there had also been successful fighting near Shaiba two days previously. These victories and the increase of force enabled the expedition to consolidate its position. But though the force had been doubled it had only been provided with less than half its proper scale of medical equipment, and the river transport was not sufficient for its requirements. "These deficiencies," say the Commission, "do not appear to have had sufficient recognition by the Indian Government."

Sir John Nixon's orders from Sir Beauchamp Duff, the Commander-in-Chief in India, were.—

(1) To retain complete control of the lower portion of Mesopotamia, comprising the Basra Vilayet,

(2) So far as possible to secure the safety of the oilfields; and

(3) To submit a plan (a) for the effective occupation of Basra Vilayet, (b) for a subsequent advance on Baghdad.

These orders were dated March 24, but they were not communicated to the India Office by the Indian Government until May 3. The Secretary of State did not, therefore, for some time appreciate that Sir John Nixon's orders involved advances to Nasiriye on the Euphrates, and Amara, on the Tigris, both of which places are included in the Turkish province or Vilayet of Basra.

But after much correspondence between England and India, the Secretary of State sanctioned successively the advance of Sir John Nixon's forces to Amara, which was captured by General Townshend on June 3, to Nasiriye, which was taken by General Gorringe after a victory on July 25, and to Kut-el-Amara, or Kut, which was occupied by General Townshend on September 29, after defeating the Turks and taking 950 prisoners, 17 guns, and much booty.

The occupation of the Vilayet of Basra was thus completed, and at Kut General Nixon had secured a highly convenient halting-place, which completely covered the enemy's main approaches to the territory occupied by us.

ORIGIN OF FIRST ADVANCE ON BAGHDAD

From quite early in the history of the expedition the possibility of an ultimate advance on Baghdad was in the minds of the authorities in India, Mesopotamia, and England. The Viceroy frequently referred to such a possibility, the Staff of Simla drew up various "appreciations" on the subject, and the very day after the capture of Basra on November 23, the Indian Government's Political Agent in Mesopotamia, Sir Percy Cox, forwarded to India, after consultation with General Barrett, a reasoned proposal for such an advance. This proposal was forwarded to Lord Crewe, who, however, was not prepared to sanction it "for the present."

Sir John Nixon had taken with him to Mesopotamia orders by the Commander-in-Chief in India to submit a plan for an advance on Baghdad. This plan was forwarded to Simla on August 30, 1915, but it was not communicated to the Viceroy or the Secretary of State, and the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Beauchamp Duff, wrote on the plan, "Unless we can get back troops from France, Egypt, or elsewhere, I fear that Baghdad, invaluable as its capture would be, is out of the question."

However, on October 3, when General Townshend was pursuing the Turks after his victory at Kut and had almost reached Azizie, 50 miles north of Kut, General Nixon suddenly wired to the Secretary of State, "I consider I am strong enough to open road to Baghdad, and with this intention I propose to concentrate at Azizie." Apparently General Nixon's idea was that contained in the plan, which he had forwarded to India—viz., that he would follow on the heels of the disorganised

Turks into Baghdad. But, owing to unsuitable and insufficient transport, General Townshend was unable to overtake and again defeat the Turks before they had time to reorganise in a new position at Ctesiphon. When he realised this, General Townshend wished to retire to Kut, but General Nixon still pressed his proposal on the Government, and ordered the Sixth Division to concentrate at Azizie.

But the Home Government were not prepared at the moment to sanction the adventure. As early as April 24, Lord Crewe had stated, "In Mesopotamia a safe game must be played." Mr Chamberlain, who, on May 27, had succeeded Lord Crewe, as Secretary of State for India, adopted a similar policy, and on October 4 wired to the Viceroy that it was "imperative to stop the further advance of General Nixon's force." Orders in this sense were wired to General Nixon on October 5, and the advance on Baghdad was therefore apparently abandoned.

But on October 4, the very day on which Mr. Chamberlain had telegraphed to stop Nixon, the Cabinet met and considered that "if forces available are sufficient to take and hold the place (Baghdad) political reasons were thought to make its occupation desirable." On October 8, Mr Chamberlain wired to the Viceroy: "The Cabinet are so impressed with great political and military advantages of occupation of Baghdad that every effort will be made by us to supply the force that is necessary. We do not wish to attempt it with insufficient forces." Again, on October 21, Mr. Chamberlain wired:—

"At present moment it seems the German attempt to break through to Constantinople will succeed, and our position and prospects in Gallipoli are most uncertain. Arabs are wavering and will probably join Turks unless we can offer them great inducement. We are therefore in great need of striking success in the East."

It is clear, therefore, that political considerations largely influenced the Government in re-opening the proposal for the advance on Baghdad after it had been abandoned. The Commission observe—

"The military experts cannot be made solely responsible for the consequences of a decision into the consideration of which outside political factors have necessarily entered," and the evidence of Sir Beauchamp Duff is cited to the effect that, when political arguments were adduced by those above him in authority, he was ready to incur greater risks than would be justifiable from a merely military point of view. In pursuance of the Cabinet's decision, Mr. Chamberlain wired to General Nixon on October 8.—

"To both occupy and hold Baghdad what addition to your present force are you confident will be necessary?"

To which General Nixon replied,

"No additions are necessary to my present force to beat Nur-ed-din and occupy Baghdad, of this I am confident," but he added he would require an additional division and one cavalry regiment to enable him permanently to occupy Baghdad.

On October 9 the Viceroy wired to Mr. Chamberlain that he was glad of the Cabinet's decision, that he accepted Nixon's estimate of necessary reinforcements, and that these should reach Baghdad not later than one month after the capture of that city, which was the period he

calculated must elapse before the Turks could concentrate in strength to attempt its recapture

Meanwhile the Government at home referred the question of the advance on Baghdad to the General Staff at the War Office, to the joint Naval and Military Staffs, and to a special Committee presided over by Sir T. Holderness, Permanent Under-Secretary at the India Office. All these authorities agreed that the capture of Baghdad by Sir John Nixon's existing force presented no difficulties, but that in order to ensure the retention of the city a reinforcement of one or two divisions were necessary. It appears, however, that none of these expert authorities went into the question of the sufficiency of Sir J. Nixon's transport, or of the possibility of rapidly moving the proposed large reinforcements up river from Basra to Baghdad, a distance of 500 miles. This is the more surprising, as there were at the time, both in the India Office and the War Office, documents showing the great difficulties of Sir John Nixon's existing force through lack of river transport and the consequent trouble there would be in reinforcing it. The Government, however, acted on what proved to be the mistaken advice of the experts, and on October 23 Mr Chamberlain authorised the advance on Baghdad in the following terms:—

“If Nixon is satisfied that the force he has available is sufficient for the operation he may march on Baghdad. Two divisions will be sent to him as soon as possible, but owing to relief and transport arrangements reinforcements will take time to dispatch. Probable date will be wired later.”

BATTLE OF CTESIPHON.

Although Sir John Nixon had proposed the advance on Baghdad on October 3, and received sanction to it on October 23, General Townshend's force did not actually move forward until the middle of November. This delay of six weeks was due to the insufficiency of the river transport for the movement of the supplies up river.

There were available for General Townshend's advance about 15,000 men, but there were practically no reserves to support him, the remainder of the troops in the country being required to guard the lines of communication, which were 290 miles from Kut to Basra, and would be prolonged to 500 miles if the expedition advanced to Baghdad. General Townshend's troops were physically debilitated by their previous strenuous fighting in the hot months, and his British battalions were 30 per cent below strength. It was quite uncertain when the promised reinforcements of two divisions from Europe would arrive at Basra, and when they arrived at Basra their transport to the front must take weeks, if not months. These were the circumstances in General Townshend's mind when, early in October, he pointed out to General Kemball, General Nixon's Chief of the Staff, that “unless great risk is to be run,” it was absolutely necessary that the advance should be carried out methodically and with greater forces than those then available. But General Townshend did not press his objections, and when he advanced on November 21, to attack the two strong lines of Turkish

entrenchments at Ctesiphon "a spirit of intense optimism animated the Headquarters and Administrative Staff." It is true that General Townshend had only some 11,000 effectives available for attacking an entrenched force of Turks estimated at 11,000 to 13,000. But the majority of the enemy were troops who had already been beaten several times in Mesopotamia. Moreover, General Townshend, before the battle, was not informed of the possible Turkish reinforcements, whose arrival on the scene changed his victory into defeat

After severe fighting, General Townshend's troops, on November 22, captured the first line of Turkish entrenchments and took 1,300 prisoners; they also penetrated the second line of entrenchments, but were here counter-attacked by fresh Turkish reinforcements and forced back into the first line, which they had previously captured. Our losses had been very heavy. General Townshend found himself not only numerically very inferior to the enemy, but in some danger of being surrounded and cut off. He was also short of supplies. He was therefore compelled to fall back fighting to Kut, which he reached with the exhausted remnant of his troops on December 3. His total casualties at and since the battle of Ctesiphon had been more than 690 killed and 3,800 wounded—a loss of over 30 per cent

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADVANCE.

The Commission's findings as to the first abortive advance on Baghdad are as follows:—

The advance to Baghdad under the conditions existing in October, 1915, was an offensive movement based upon political and military miscalculations and attempted with tired and insufficient forces and inadequate preparation. It resulted in the surrender of more than a division of our finest fighting troops, and the casualties incurred in the ineffective attempts to relieve Kut amounted to some 23,000 men. The loss of prestige associated with these military failures was less than might have been anticipated owing to the deep impression made throughout and beyond the localities where the combats occurred by the splendid fighting power of the British and Indian forces engaged.

Various authorities and high officials are connected with the sanction given to this untoward advance. Each and all, in our judgment, according to their relative and respective positions, must be made responsible for the errors in judgment to which they were parties and which formed the basis of their advice or orders.

The weightiest share of responsibility lies with Sir John Nixon, whose confident optimism was the main cause of the decision to advance. The other persons responsible were: In India, the Viceroy (Lord Hardinge) and the Commander-in-Chief (Sir Beauchamp Duff); in England, the Military Secretary of the India Office (Sir Edmund Barrow), the Secretary of State for India (Mr. Austen Chamberlain), and the War Committee of the Cabinet. We put these names in the order and sequence of responsibility. The expert advisers of the Government who

were consulted also approved the advance and are responsible for their advice, but the papers submitted to us suggest that the approval of the naval and military experts was reluctant and was perhaps partly induced by a natural desire not to disappoint the hopes of advantage to the general situation which the Government entertained. It is, however, notable that the experts unanimously anticipated no difficulty in the advance on Baghdad, but only in holding it. We do not attach any share in the responsibility for the decision to advance to Baghdad to the Councils of the Secretary of State for India and of the Viceroy, as we have been unable to ascertain from the evidence laid before us that the advance to Baghdad was ever brought before them in such a manner as to allow them to give their personal advice and opinion upon it.

We have included the War Committee of the Cabinet and the Secretary of State for India amongst those upon whom responsibility for this misadventure rests. It is true that the War Committee and the Secretary of State acted upon the opinion of their expert military advisers, and that the Secretary of State only gave his assent to the advance after he had received an assurance from the General on the spot that he had an available force sufficient for his purpose. But so long as the system of responsible departmental administration exists in this country, those who are political heads of departments in time of war, whether they be civilian or military, cannot be entirely immune from the consequences of their own action. They have the option and power of accepting or rejecting the advice of their expert subordinates. The acceptance by a chief of wrong advice from expert subordinates may be an extenuation of, but cannot secure complete immunity from, the responsibility for the evils which may ensue.

The Cabinet from the first laid down the principle, from which they never departed, that questions jointly involving civil and military policy should, in existing circumstances, only be decided by the Cabinet. This authority they exercised throughout, though at times they largely delegated their powers to the War Committee of the Cabinet.

KUT RELIEF OPERATIONS

After full consideration, Sir John Nixon and General Townshend agreed that Kut should be held by General Townshend, and that his relief should be effected as quickly as possible with the reinforcements on the way from France and elsewhere. This decision received the assent both of Simla and Whitehall. The sick, wounded, and prisoners were evacuated and sent downstream to Basra. On December 6 the Cavalry Brigade left Kut, and on the 7th the Turkish investment of that place was complete.

In the words of the Commission, "the history of the attempts to relieve Kut is melancholy reading enough—a record of a prolonged

struggle carried on with inadequate means under abnormal conditions of atrocious weather, and terminating in failure." Sir Fenton Aylmer, Adjutant-General of the Indian Army, was sent to take command of the relieving force

The two divisions from France, the bulk of which were still on the high seas, were only gradually and in piecemeal fashion arriving at Basra. Owing to a misunderstanding units and their equipment had been embarked on different ships; in consequence they often arrived the one before the other, and time was needed for their proper reorganisation before advancing. The equipment, especially in heavy artillery and high-explosive shells, was far below what was required for storming modern entrenchments. The available transport in Mesopotamia was not sufficient even to carry the men and ammunition to the front. At two critical periods in the operations there were as many as 10,000 and 12,000 men and a quantity of guns at Basra, which were sorely needed, and might have meant victory at the front, but could not be moved there. All the conditions pointed to the necessity of waiting till the new Army had been properly organised and its deficiencies made good. Unfortunately an early advance was considered necessary before reorganisation was possible. During December General Townshend sent from Kut a number of telegrams in which he urged, as reasons for his immediate relief, the dangers of enemy reinforcements and of a determined onslaught by superior numbers, the impaired *moral* of his troops, heavy losses in British officers, anxiety as to ammunition, etc.

But it is noteworthy that throughout this month he never, except on December 5, put forward deficiency of supplies as a reason for accelerating his relief. On December 5 he wired, "I hope we can be relieved by a month; my rations for British troops are only one month." But a few days later he wired that he had rations sufficient to last till the beginning of February. Ultimately, it will be remembered, he found that with the utmost economy the food just lasted till the end of April! Neither General Nixon nor General Aylmer definitely asked General Townshend how long his supplies would permit him to hold out, and his failure to inform them as to this was one of the main factors in the hurried advance of the relieving force from Ali Gharbi on January 4, 1915.

The Turks had prepared a series of entrenched positions astride of the Tigris. They were driven from the first of these at Sheikh Saad on January 7-9, from the second at Wadi on January 13-14, but the exhausted troops, who had been fighting through continuous mud and rain, failed in an attempt to oust the enemy from their third position at Umm-el-Hannah a few days later. The casualties during these operations amounted to over 8,000 officers and men. A pause was imperative, and it was not till the beginning of March that the relieving force again advanced. On March 7 a night attack in the Dujailah Redoubt at Es Sinn failed, chiefly through miscalculation of the time required for the preliminary night march.

General Aylmer was then replaced by General Sir George Gorringe, who, after some preliminary successes, also failed with heavy losses in two attacks on April 9 and 22 to carry the position to which the Turks

had retired at Sanna-i-yat. The heavy floods made all movements most difficult, and the men at times could not use their rifles, which were clogged with mud. After 16 days' continuous fighting, not only against the Turks but against the floods, all hope of relieving Kut had to be given up. The losses had exceeded 33 per cent, and were even greater in British officers, and the fighting efficiency of the force was seriously affected.

On April 29 Kut surrendered.

The Commission find that the main causes of the failure to relieve Kut were premature attacks, inadequate transport, and insufficient numerical superiority over a strongly entrenched enemy.

It should be added that after the fall of Kut the Expeditionary Force adopted a defensive rôle, and occupied the remainder of the year in consolidating their position and in improving river and land communications and supplies until time was ripe for beginning the second and successful advance on Baghdad, which has recently been consummated.

The Commission do not deal at any length with the conditions in Kut during its siege, but they publish, as an appendix, an account of the siege by Colonel Hehir, Principal Medical Officer to the besieged force.

The Turks closed in on General Townshend on December 7, and at first their assaults were numerous and severe. But after three days' fighting about Christmas the enemy were repulsed with such heavy losses that no serious attempts to storm the town were made for the remainder of the siege. The real enemy was starvation, and this compelled the surrender of the place on April 29, 1916, after a most gallant and tenacious defence of 147 days.

The following extracts from Colonel Hehir's paper show the straits to which the garrison were reduced.—

“ During the last month of the siege men at fatigues, such as trench-digging, after 10 minutes' work had to rest a while and go at it again; men on sentry-go would drop down, those carrying loads would rest every few hundred yards; men availed themselves of every opportunity of lolling about or lying down. There were instances of Indians returning from trench duty in the evening seemingly with nothing the matter who laid down and were found dead in the morning—death due to starvation asthenia. Men in such a low state of vitality can stand little in the shape of illness—an attack of diarrhoea that they would have got rid of in a day or so at the beginning of the siege often ended fatally—all recuperative power had gone. At the end of the siege I doubt whether there was a single person equal to a five-mile march, carrying his equipment. Personally, up to the middle of March I could make a complete inspection of the front-line trenches and fort (about five miles) in the morning; I had then to halve it, and at the end of April while doing even half I had to rest on the way. Practically all officers were in the same condition of physical incapacity.

“ The behaviour of the troops throughout the siege was splendid. The defaulter's sheet of the British soldier was a *carte blanche*, and there was no grumbling; there was almost a complete absence of suicide and insanity.”

The difficulties in rationing the Indian troops were much enhanced by caste prejudices as to food. For a long time many of them refused to eat horse or mule flesh. Had it not been for this, these animals could not only have been used as food for the men, but the grain they consumed could have been devoted to the same purpose. It is doubtful, however, if this would have done more than prolong the agony. The relieving force was not strong enough in artillery, high-explosive shells, and other appliances, without which attacks on modern entrenchments seem absolutely futile.

When the inevitable happened and the town surrendered a striking tribute was paid by the starving men to their commanders. Right up to the end of the siege General Townshend and his brigadiers retained the confidence and allegiance of their men. After the terms of surrender had been settled and the Generals were departing in a steam-boat as prisoners of war, their men formed up along the river-side and gave them a parting cheer as a proof of their unbroken loyalty.

EQUIPMENT AND COMMISSARIAT DEFICIENCIES

Every General who appeared before the Commission agreed that the Mesopotamian Expedition was badly equipped. Sir Beauchamp Duff informed them that the Indian Army, which furnished the expedition, was organised only for semi-savage fighting, was not well found for an overseas expedition, to a large extent had second-rate equipment, and was "backward in every particular."

The unpreparedness of the Indian Army for its task in Mesopotamia was primarily due to a long-standing policy of economy and restriction of military preparation to the needs of frontier warfare, for which the Home and Indian Governments were, of course, responsible, and not Sir Beauchamp Duff and the General Staff at Simla. But the unpreparedness for overseas warfare was well known to the Indian military authorities, and when they undertook the management of an expedition which was to fight against Turkey supported by Germany, they ought immediately to have striven energetically to bring the equipment of the expedition up to the standard of modern warfare. The Indian Government were guilty of omissions in nearly every branch of military provision, with the exception of the commissariat, though even here the standard was low and the distribution of food uneven. Serious defects in military equipment, resulting in unnecessary suffering and casualties amongst the troops, were allowed to persist month after month during the first 14 months of the campaign, when the Indian Government were responsible for its management.

As regards heavy artillery, which India was not in a position to supply, the Indian military authorities did not, for at least a year, "appraise, anticipate, or represent to England" the needs of the expedition. Meanwhile the troops in Mesopotamia had, without adequate preparation by heavy artillery, to attack across the open, and at the cost of heavy casualties, strongly fortified trenches with inferior and insufficient artillery. The advance against Ctesiphon was undertaken with only 18 field guns and 6 horse-artillery guns; and the lack of

proper artillery also contributed to the failure of the operations for the relief of Kut. There was also a deficiency in aeroplanes, which, however, the War Office could not supply owing to more urgent demands from other theatres of the war.

There is a long list of other items of equipment such as wire-cutters, water-carts, tents, bombs, blankets, etc., deficiencies in which contributed largely to our heavy casualties and reverses. There was at one time a lack of summer clothing even for the patients in hospital, and in the bitter winter months troops had been sent from India in "shorts" and tropical clothing. The Commander-in-Chief originally intended to leave the provision of warm clothing for the troops to private charity, and only consented to undertake its provision after a protest by the Viceroy.

The Commission's finding on this part of their inquiry is:—

During the period for which the Indian Government were responsible, the commissariat of the expedition cannot be said to have been up to the standard of our Army in France, but there was no general breakdown. Discomfort and want were at times experienced, mainly through lack of transport, and illness arose from serious deficiencies in diet. The whole system of supply was on too low a standard, and was badly organised. We have reason to believe that it has been materially improved since the War Office became responsible for the commissariat.

The ration originally supplied to the Indian troops was deficient in nutritive qualities, and a serious outbreak of scurvy ensued. Since then this ration has twice been improved, but it still requires careful attention as to the adequacy of its nutritive powers.

In other essentials the expedition was badly and insufficiently equipped, and little, if any, effort was made to remedy deficiencies until the War Office took over the expedition. It is difficult to arrive at any conclusion other than that the wants of the expedition received meagre attention and illiberal treatment at the hands of the Simla authorities during the years 1914-15.

DISPUTES WITH THE HOME GOVERNMENT.

The history of the supply of reinforcements to the force is a melancholy tale of altercation between London and Simla. Although up to the time of the advance on Baghdad the expedition was always numerically strong enough to cope with the Turkish forces, yet this result was only attained after protracted wrangling between the Governments at home and in India, neither of whom appeared willing to accept the task of reinforcing an expedition for the success of which they were jointly responsible. The danger and friction created by such a situation is well exemplified by what happened in the early part of 1915. At that period the military authorities in England and India were agreed that the Mesopotamia Expedition was in danger of attack by superior Turkish forces, and that its reinforcement by a division was imperative; but the Secretary of State informed the Viceroy that no reinforcements could be dispatched from England, and the Viceroy informed the Secretary of State that no further troops could be spared from India. The difficulty

was only got over, after much delay and discussion, by the Home Government definitely ordering India to send reinforcements to Mesopotamia, and relieving the Viceroy of all responsibility for any consequent danger to India. The reinforcements were sent, though only at the last moment, and they enabled Sir John Nixon to defeat and drive the Turks before him in the spring and summer of 1915.

In fine, the arrangements for drafts and reinforcements were lacking in co-ordination as between the Indian and home authorities, and this want of co-ordination led to the failure to supply effective reinforcements in connexion with the advance on Baghdad and the operations for the relief of Kut.

TRANSPORT.

A shortage of river transport existed from the time of the occupation of Kurna in December, 1914, and became serious from and after May, 1915. Despite additions that were made, the shortage had become relatively even greater in April, 1916, than at any earlier period of the campaign, owing to the increased numbers of the force. Practically at no time after the advance above Kurna was river transport adequate to requirements. It greatly delayed military operations, in which celerity was an important factor for success, it affected the comfort and feeding of the troops, and it was a direct cause of suffering to the sick and wounded. It took nearly two months to concentrate troops and supplies for the advance from Amara to Kut-el-Amara, and the advance towards Baghdad was fatally delayed from the same cause. It seems almost certain that, but for the shortage of river transport, the Turkish Army would have been destroyed between Kut and Ctesiphon. But the want was most acutely felt during the strenuous days of the attempt to succour General Townshend, when time was of the utmost importance in view of the straits to which his garrison was reduced. Shortage of river transport was the chief cause of the failure to relieve Kut.

The reasons for this shortage were as follows: Steamers of low draught and peculiar type are necessary for the navigation of the Tigris and Euphrates. There were only a few such steamers plying in Mesopotamia when the expedition arrived in November, 1914, unaccompanied by any river steamers. The forces in Mesopotamia were doubled in the spring of 1915 and again more than doubled early in 1916; but except for sending, early in 1915, a few craft which had been ordered for General Barrett's original small force, and were quite inadequate for the increased force, India sent no supply of ready-built steamers to Mesopotamia till the spring of 1916. On the other hand, new vessels, which were asked for by General Nixon in the summer of 1915, took 12 months to build in England and dispatch to Mesopotamia. Consequently they were not available till long after the retreat from Ctesiphon and the fall of Kut.

The Commission comment on the unbusinesslike procedure of the India Office in providing these vessels, but point out that in any case they could not have been built in time to affect the advance on Baghdad or the operations for the relief of Kut.

With regard to the advance on Baghdad, Sir John Nixon was in-

formed on October 28 by his Inspector-General of Communications that he estimated that, in addition to the shipping already ordered, 12 more steamers and 24 barges would be required in view of the expected reinforcements. This estimate General Nixon did not pass on to India or London. If he had done so, in view of the insistence by both the Indian and Home Governments on the necessity for the prompt arrival at Baghdad of the reinforcing two divisions, it is at least open to doubt whether the sanction to the advance would not have been countermanded.

In the matter of the provision of river craft, the Indian Government was entirely out of touch with the situation in Mesopotamia, they made no effort to estimate beforehand what the requirements would be, and the officials criticised or misread the demands made from Mesopotamia for ready-made craft, with the result that a number of such craft, which were available in India, did not arrive in Mesopotamia till early in 1916. Had they been made available for General Nixon between October and November, 1915, they would have materially lightened his transport problems, and might, perhaps, have even altered the history of the campaign.

The findings as to transport are:—

(a) From the first the paramount importance both of river and railway transport in Mesopotamia was insufficiently realised by the military authorities in India.

(b) A deficiency of river transport existed from the time the Army left tidal water and advanced up river from Kurna. This deficiency became very serious as the lines of communication lengthened and the numbers of the force increased.

(c) Up to the end of 1915 the efforts made to rectify the deficiency of river transport were wholly inadequate.

(d) For want of comprehensive grasp of the transport situation, and insufficiency of river steamers, we find the military authorities in India are responsible. The responsibility is a grave one.

(e) River hospital steamers were an urgent requirement for the proper equipment of the expedition, and were not ordered until much too late.

(f) With General Sir J. Nixon rests the responsibility for recommending the advances in 1915 with insufficient transport and equipment. The evidence did not disclose an imperative need to advance without due preparation. For what ensued from shortage of steamers both as concerns suffering of the wounded and military losses General Sir John Nixon must, in such circumstances, be held to blame.

(g) During the first four months of 1916 the shortage of transport was fatal to the operations undertaken for the relief of Kut. Large reinforcements could not be moved to the front in time to take part in critical battles. Based upon information received from General Townshend, as to the urgent necessity for his immediate relief, operations were undertaken, notwithstanding the extreme transport difficulty, but in all the circumstances we do not attach blame for this to the General in Mesopotamia directing the operations.

(h) Facilities for the discharge and handling of cargo at Basra, also

provision of works for the erection and repair of river craft, were hopelessly inadequate.

(4) Proceedings in connexion with the filling of orders for river craft by the Director of the Royal Indian Marine in India, and the India Office in London, were far from satisfactory

(b) Looking at the facts, which from the first must have been apparent to any administrator, military or civilian, who gave a few minutes' consideration to the map, and to the conditions in Mesopotamia, the want of foresight and provision for the most fundamental needs of the expedition reflects discredit upon the organising aptitude of all the authorities concerned. General Sir William Robertson, Chief of the General Staff, Whitehall, in a document to which we have already referred, states: "In general, the operations were allowed in 1915 to develop without proper regard to the vital questions of supply and maintenance," in which opinion our investigations lead us unreservedly to concur.

MEDICAL BREAKDOWN.

The Commission were unable to make an interim report on the medical arrangements as directed by Parliament, but they have devoted to the subject a separate section (Part X.), which is practically a complete report in itself, dealing with provision for the sick and wounded

The Commission adopt the principal conclusions of the Vincent-Bingley Commission, which were, that from a very early stage in the campaign the sick and wounded underwent avoidable discomfort and at times great suffering, owing to deficiencies in medical arrangements, especially as regards river hospital steamers, land ambulance transport, hospitals, and medical *personnel* and equipment. The sufferings of the wounded from these defects became aggravated after the battle of Ctesiphon, and culminated during the Kut relief operations early in January, 1915, when there was a complete breakdown of the medical arrangements. For these deficiencies the Vincent-Bingley Commission divide responsibility between the authorities in India and Mesopotamia. The Report of the Vincent-Bingley Commission is printed in full as an appendix to the Report.

The Commission supplement and support the conclusions of the Vincent-Bingley Report with special evidence which they have taken, especially as to the early phases of the campaign and as to the responsibilities of the higher authorities in India, two subjects with which the earlier Commission did not fully deal.

The Commission severely criticise deficiencies in medical equipment in the early phases of the campaign. Sir W. Babtie was Director of Medical Services in India up to June, 1915, and the Commission state that, knowing the Army Medical Service in India to be organised only for frontier warfare, knowing the provision of the field ambulances and hospitals to be deficient, and knowing the medical *personnel* to be insufficient, Sir William made no adequate efforts to improve these defects so as to equip the Mesopotamian Expedition in a manner suitable for campaigning in an unhealthy tropical climate against an enemy

who was in alliance with and supported by the foremost exponents of modern warfare.

The expedition was dispatched to Mesopotamia, and reinforcements were dispatched to the expedition with medical *personnel* and hospitals short even of the authorised scale—a scale which in itself was insufficient. Each division was only supplied with 12 sections of field ambulance instead of its proper complement of 20. This was due to medical *personnel* being retained in India for forces which might be required to meet internal disturbances or frontier warfare. The Commission are not convinced that the policy of preparing for possible warfare in India at the expense of actual warfare in Mesopotamia was justifiable. But even if this be conceded as a justification for allowing Mesopotamia to be severely understaffed in medical *personnel*, it was clearly the duty of Surgeon-General Babtie to impress on the authorities in India and at home the dangers of such a proceeding, and to have urged strongly upon the authorities in India that they should apply to England for assistance. This he did not do.

No river hospital steamers were provided for what it was known must be largely a riverine campaign. Consequently until 1916 the sick and wounded had to use ordinary river transport steamers. These were always overburdened with ordinary transport work, were not infrequently used for carrying animals, and it was not always possible properly to clear them of their accumulations of filth and dung before they were used for sick and wounded troops. No wheeled ambulance transport was provided. It follows that ordinary Army transport carts were the only vehicles available for the sick and wounded where land transport was necessary. There is an overwhelming mass of evidence as to the inhumanity of using these carts for the wounded. Padding for them was not always available. In some cases dead bodies were even used as cushions. Even when padded they were cruel and dangerous for certain classes of wounded. All this must have been well known to Surgeon-General Babtie, or might have been easily ascertained by inquiry or experiment. His only action in regard to developing a more suitable vehicle than the bullock-tonga was to ask the Maharaja of Benares to provide a special corps of pony-tongas, none of which were, however, available in Mesopotamia till long after Sir W. Babtie had left India.

Surgeon-General Babtie's administration was marked by serious faults, for which he must be blamed, and the importance of which cannot be minimised. But the shortness of his experience as Director of Medical Services when the war broke out, and the fact that he had to work in an atmosphere very unfavourable to reforming innovation, must be regarded as diminishing the weight of the censure he deserves. He is undoubtedly a man of great ability, and having regard to all the circumstances the faults of his administration were not such as to prove him unfit for important responsible administrative posts.

In matters affecting the sick and wounded the want of frankness has painfully impressed the Commission. A number of instances are given in which defects in medical arrangements were not reported. Perhaps the most striking of these is in connexion with the medical breakdown

after Ctesiphon, when over 3,500 wounded had to be removed from the battlefield to the river bank, in some cases a distance of 10 miles, without proper ambulance transport, and with an insufficiency of medical personnel, of food, and of comforts, so that a large proportion of the wounded had to make their way on foot in spite of their injured condition. When they arrived at the river the available steamer accommodation was gravely inadequate. The wounded and weary men had to be crowded into steamers and barges without sufficient medical attention, appliances, or conveniences. Some of the wounded were disembarked at Amara, but the majority went down to Basra, a journey from the battlefield which in some cases took as much as 14 days, and the discomforts of which were aggravated for the wounded by the presence on board of many cases of dysentery and other sickness.

How one of these river convoys arrived at Basra is thus described by Major Carter, the medical officer in charge of an ocean hospital ship, which was waiting at Basra to receive the wounded.—

“I was standing on the bridge on the evening when the *Medjidieh* arrived. She had two steel barges, without any protection against the rain, as far as I remember. As this ship, with two barges, came up to us I saw that she was absolutely packed, and the barges, too, with men. The barges were slipped, and the *Medjidieh* was brought alongside the *Varela*. When she was about 300 or 400 yards off it looked as if she was festooned with ropes. The stench when she was close was quite definite, and I found that what I mistook for ropes were dried stalactites of human faeces. The patients were so huddled and crowded together on the ship that they could not perform the offices of nature clear of the edge of the ship, and the whole of the ship's side was covered with stalactites of human faeces. This is what I then saw. A certain number of men were standing and kneeling on the immediate perimeter of the ship. Then we found a mass of men huddled up anyhow—some with blankets and some without. They were lying in a pool of dysentery about 30 ft. square. They were covered with dysentery and dejecta generally from head to foot. With regard to the first man I examined, I put my hand into his trousers, and I thought that he had a haemorrhage. His trousers were full almost to the waist with something warm and slimy. I took my hand out, and thought it was blood clot. It was dysentery. The man had a fractured thigh, and his thigh was perforated in five or six places. He had apparently been writhing about the deck of the ship. Many cases were almost as bad. There were a certain number of cases of terribly bad bed sores. In my report I describe mercilessly to the Government of India how I found men with their limbs splinted with wood strips from ‘Johnny Walker’ whisky boxes, ‘Bhoosa’ wire, and that sort of thing.”

“Question.—Were they British or Indian?—British and Indian mixed.”

The withdrawal of the wounded to Basra which resulted in such appalling conditions was officially reported to the Secretary of State as follows:—

“Wounded satisfactorily disposed of. Many likely to recover in country comfortably placed in hospitals at Amara and Basra. Those

for invaliding are being placed direct on two hospital ships that were ready at Basra on arrival of river boats. General condition of wounded very satisfactory Medical arrangements under circumstances of considerable difficulty worked splendidly "

Surgeon-General Hathaway, the principal medical officer in Mesopotamia, who was responsible for drafting the above telegram, afterwards sent in to India a detailed report of the evacuation of the wounded, and the Commission say " Nobody reading that report would gather that anything untoward had happened, or that the wounded had undergone any special or avoidable sufferings."

The first and only official report which disclosed the serious condition of the wounded after Ctesiphon was sent to India on December 14 by an officer who was not in any way responsible for the arrangements for their evacuation from the battlefield to Basra, a Major Carter, whose evidence is quoted above. This report was not shown to the Commander-in-Chief in India, but there is evidence that Surgeon-General MacNeece, the Director of Medical Services in India, mentioned the matter at a Staff Conference at which the Commander-in-Chief was present on December 23. Notwithstanding this, on December 30 Sir Beauchamp Duff, the Commander-in-Chief, gave the Viceroy, in a letter, a "reassuring impression" in regard to the provision for the sick and wounded, which was "profoundly misleading"

In January Surgeon-General MacNeece was sent to Mesopotamia to consult as to medical arrangements, but his report was "a very inadequate representation of what had actually taken place" Even when, at last, and under pressure from the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, the Commander-in-Chief appointed the Vincent-Bingley Commission, their original terms of reference were so drawn as to exclude them from inquiring into the breakdown after Ctesiphon. But at the suggestion of the Vincent-Bingley Commission, their terms of reference were extended, and their striking account of the sufferings of the wounded after Ctesiphon finally enabled the truth to break through the tough veil of official reticence

The Commission make a number of recommendations of a minor character with a view to improving the efficiency of the Indian Army Medical Service in war time and generally improving the standard of medical provision for the troops in India. There is urgent necessity for a thorough reform by the Indian Government of the whole system upon which their medical services are based Sir Alfred Keogh, Director-General, Army Medical Services at the War Office, stated: "I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the medical arrangements connected with the Army in India have been for years and years most disgraceful. I say that with a full sense of responsibility I have served for many years in India. I have not been there for some time now, but in my opinion things are not better than they were Anything more disgraceful than the carelessness and want of attention with regard to the sick soldier in India it is impossible to imagine."

The medical provision for the troops in Mesopotamia has, however, improved since April, 1916. Sanitation and the prevention of disease are now properly organised, and appliances of all kinds are being con-

tinually improved, as better transport facilities on the Tigris distribute the necessary machinery and apparatus. Altogether the public may be assured that a new spirit exists in the medical command in Mesopotamia.

The medical provision for the Mesopotamia Campaign was from the beginning insufficient; by reason of the continuance of this insufficiency there was a lamentable breakdown, causing severe and unavoidable suffering to the sick and wounded after the battle of Ctesiphon and the battles in January, 1916; there was amelioration in March and April, 1916; but since then the improvement has been continual, until it is reasonable to hope that now the medical provision is satisfactory. The main deficiencies were in river hospital steamers, medical *personnel*, river transport, and ambulance land transport.

A grave responsibility for that part of the suffering which resulted from avoidable circumstances rests with the Senior Medical Officer of the Force, Surgeon-General G. H. Hathaway, who did not represent with sufficient promptitude and force the needs of the services for which he was responsible, and in particular failed to urge the necessity for adequate and suitable transport for the sick and wounded with that insistence which the situation demanded. Sir John Nixon was throughout solicitous as to the condition of the wounded. His main mistake was to rely too absolutely on the statements made to him by Surgeon-General Hathaway; to that extent he may be blamed.

The officer directly responsible for the deficiencies of medical provision in Mesopotamia is, however, the Director of Medical Services, India. This appointment was held by Surgeon-General Sir William Babtie up to June, 1915, and afterwards by Surgeon-General J. G. MacNeece. Sir William Babtie was an officer of ability and knowledge, but he did not bring these qualities sufficiently to bear upon the task before him. He accepted obviously insufficient medical provision without protest, and without any adequate effort to improve it. He cannot, therefore, be held blameless. Surgeon-General MacNeece was an officer thoroughly desirous of fulfilling the duties assigned to him, but he was a man of advancing years and diminishing strength, unequal to the position he was called upon to fill, and his administration showed no signs of the vigour and efficiency that were required.

The Home Government agreed with the Indian Government in limiting the general military preparations of India before the war in the interests of retrenchment, and provision was accordingly not made for such an expedition as that to Mesopotamia. The limitation of medical preparation and the low standard of medical treatment in the Indian Army at the outbreak of war were the natural outcome of this policy.

The Secretary of State showed an earnest and continuous anxiety as to the condition of the wounded, and the only comment that can be made upon his procedure is that he did not fully utilise the official powers at his disposal for the purpose of disposing at an earlier period an investigation into the treatment of the wounded in Mesopotamia.

To Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, as Viceroy, belongs the general responsibility attaching to his position as the head of the Indian

Government. In regard to the actual medical administration he showed throughout the utmost goodwill, but considering the paramount authority of his office, his action was not sufficiently strenuous and peremptory.

A more severe censure must be passed upon the Commander-in-Chief in India, who failed closely to superintend the adequacy of medical provision in Mesopotamia. He declined for a considerable time, until ultimately forced by the superior authority of the Viceroy, to give credence to rumours which proved to be true, and failed to take the measures which a subsequent experience shows would have saved the wounded from avoidable suffering.

There has been misuse of official reticence as to medical defects and the sufferings of the sick and wounded.

Throughout the campaign (with insignificant exceptions) the executive and regimental medical officers and *personnel* have devoted themselves with unremitting kindness, zeal, and industry to the care of the sick and wounded with such means as were at their disposal.

DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY FOR CAMPAIGN.

The Commission comment on the system of divided responsibility during the period up to February, 1916, when the "policy" of the campaign was under the Secretary of State and its "management" under the Indian Government. Under this system a multiplicity of authorities had to be consulted. There were first the General Officer Commanding on the spot in Mesopotamia, then the Commander-in-Chief in India, then the Viceroy, then the Secretary of State for India with his Military Secretary, then the War Council with the Imperial Staff, and finally the Cabinet. Such a subdivision weakened the sense of responsibility of each authority consulted, and has made it very difficult accurately to apportion blame or credit. It was under this system that the administrative failures took place, and it was not until London took over the sole charge of the campaign in the spring of 1916 that there was any marked improvement in the management. The success since effected is a striking illustration of the all-importance of unity of control in time of war.

Moreover, under an arrangement entered into before the war, the War Office was responsible for the collection of intelligence with a view to possible military operations in Mesopotamia north of Basra, while India was responsible for collecting similar intelligence for Basra and the Persian Gulf. This delimitation of responsibility was not very logical, inasmuch as it was evident that Basra must become the base of any military operations in Mesopotamia from the Persian Gulf. The result was, that when the war came, plans of operations for a campaign in Mesopotamia north of Basra had not been prepared at Whitehall nor at Simla. When the Secretary of State ordered the expedition to start, Mesopotamia was "no man's child." The War Office was occupied with its own gigantic task at home, and India was preoccupied with fears of attacks on her frontier and of disaffection within her borders.

The Indian Government was at first lukewarm on a proposition which

it did not originate, and demurred to sending necessary reinforcements. During the first months of the campaign the India Office was stimulating the Indian Government to greater exertion by ordering them to send out additional troops. As soon as the troops sent out amounted to two Divisions, then the rôle was reversed, and it was the Indian Government who were constantly pressing upon the Home authorities the necessity of advance. The advances to Kurna, to Amara, and to Kut, though put forward as necessary defensive operations, may have been partially prompted by ambition to capture Baghdad. At any rate, Simla and Whitehall were not pulling well together, and up to the date of General Townshend's advance on Kut, no full and frank exchange of opinion seems to have taken place either as to the scope and aim of the expedition, or as to the preparation and expenditure necessary to ensure its success.

The Commission's findings as to the division of responsibility are.—

"The division of responsibility between the India Office and the Indian Government, the former undertaking policy and the latter the management of the expedition, was, in the circumstances, unworkable. The Secretary of State, who controlled the policy, did not have cognisance of the capacity of the expedition to carry out the policy. The Indian Government, who managed the expedition, did not accompany developments of policy with the necessary preparations, even when they themselves proposed those developments. The scope of the objective of the expedition was never sufficiently defined in advance, so as to make each successful move part of a well-thought-out and matured plan."

There is a Military Department at the India Office under the authority of the Secretary of State for India, and with whose advice he controls and decides the general military policy of India, but this department is not organised for the purpose of directly managing a campaign. It was, however, through the instrumentality of this department that the Mesopotamian Campaign was started, and its policy controlled by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State is also criticised for exercising his control through "Private" telegrams, which do not come before the Councils of the Viceroy and Secretary of State, are not necessarily communicated to the officials, and have not the mandatory character of public telegrams. A large number—if not the larger proportion—of the telegrams quoted in the Report referring to the advance on Baghdad are marked "Private." One of the most important of these private telegrams, conveying new and serious information as to the possible concentration of 60,000 Turkish troops near Baghdad, was, in consequence of its being marked "Private," not filed in the Military Department in India, and was not transmitted to Sir John Nixon in Mesopotamia. The use by Mr. Chamberlain of "Private" telegrams and letters instead of official despatches is considered to have delayed investigation and remedial measures in regard to the treatment of the sick and wounded. The great increase in the use of "Private" methods of communication by the Secretary of State and Viceroy tends to dispossess their Councils of their statutory powers.

The Commission conclude:—

" If the Councils of the Secretary of State and Viceroy are to be dispossessed of their old powers, such a change should be effected openly under an Act of Parliament, and not by a change in the internal procedure of the India Office."

The Viceroy's Council was not sufficiently consulted in regard to the campaign, which was, in fact, conducted solely by the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief in India. The control of the expedition was narrowed down to control by two high officials, both heavily charged with many other anxious and pressing duties, and both permanently stationed in localities which had little, if any, private or personal touch with the forces campaigning in Mesopotamia. Moreover, all criticism or suggestions for reform from subordinates was strongly resented. When General Cowper, A Q M.G. in Mesopotamia, energetically represented the need for more river transport in January, 1916, the Commander-in-Chief, at the Viceroy's instigation, telegraphed .—

" Please warn General Cowper that if anything of this sort occurs, or I receive any more querulous or petulant demands for shipping, I shall at once remove him from the force, and will refuse him any further employment of any kind "

When Major Carter represented to Sir John Nixon the condition of the wounded after Ctesiphon, General Cowper says .—

" I threatened to put him under arrest, and I said that I would get his hospital ship taken away from him for a meddlesome, interfering faddist "

As already explained, the policy of economy had prevailed in India during the years of peace before the war. When war broke out the Indian Government appeared to have wished to continue this policy. Their net military expenditure for the year 1914-15 was actually nearly 50,000/- less than the estimate which had been made for that year before war was declared, and on the assumption that expenditure would be on a peace basis. In introducing the Indian Financial Statement for 1915-16, Sir W. Meyer, the Finance Member, stated : " Our chief economy occurs under the Military Services," and, though the war had already been waging for more than eight months, he budgeted for a military expenditure half a million less than the corresponding expenditure for the previous year.

It has been argued that India had no cause to be sparing in expenditure on her overseas expeditions, because the Imperial Government had agreed to bear all cost of the expeditions above the normal cost to India of the troops despatched. But the Commission were informed that the Finance Department frequently demurred to proposed new war expenditure in the fear lest such expenditure should persist after the war, and become a charge upon India, and it was a similar motive which influenced the financial officials in their dealing with Sir J. Nixon's demand for a railway.

The official atmosphere of economy had its effect on the officers engaged in the campaign. " It is not unnatural that military and medical officers thought they were best discharging their duty to the Government by keeping down demands, by ' carrying on ' as best they could without incurring fresh expenditure, and by discouraging their subor-

dinates from pressing new ideas or ideals which, though undoubtedly beneficial to the service for which they are responsible, would entail, at any rate at the outset, additional expenditure."

Thus the atmosphere and influence of economy continued at Simla long after the war broke out, and there are indications of a reluctance on the part of the Indian Government to recognise the indisputable fact that war meant extra expenditure. They seemed to have struggled hard to carry on war upon a peace Budget, and it is hardly open to doubt that this tendency was one of the causes of the inadequate expenditure incurred, and the lack of provision made for the wants of the Mesopotamia Expedition during the first sixteen months of its operations.

The Indian Military Administration concentrates in one person the two offices of Commander-in-Chief and Military Member of the Viceroy's Council. It follows that, especially in time of war, the Commander-in-Chief is unable to perform adequately his duties as Commander-in-Chief on account of the onerous claims of his duties as Military Member. Thus Sir Beauchamp Duff never visited Mesopotamia, or Bombay, the port of embarkation to and disembarkation from Mesopotamia. In his exercise of control he relied exclusively on such official reports as reached him at Simla or Delhi. The effect of this aloofness is illustrated by the incredulity of Simla as to the medical breakdown in Mesopotamia. Lord Hardinge writes to the Secretary of State on February 18, 1916: "I may mention here that I have at last succeeded in convincing the military authorities that the medical arrangements up the Tigris are as bad as can be." A severer comment could not have been made upon the isolation and ignorance of those primarily responsible for the treatment of the wounded. Bombay, Calcutta, London, the Houses of Parliament, and private individuals, both in India and England, were all cognisant of what was going on. Simla and Delhi alone were unmoved.

But if there was over-centralisation at the head of the military administration, there remained a cumbrous dualism below. The departments of the Commander-in-Chief and the Military Member though under the same individual, are kept separate and distinct, and they are separately maintained in order to give substance to the fiction that one person is two persons. The Commander-in-Chief, in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, may think and order something in his Department which in his subsequent capacity as Military Member in another Department he may like to unthink and counter order. The procedure under this unique form of military administration results in great delay in dealing with new proposals relating to the Army.

Official evidence of an amusing nature is quoted to show that important proposals may have to go through eighteen or twenty processes of examination and "minuting" before they are finally agreed to or rejected. Though this lengthy procedure was modified during the war, yet many witnesses bore testimony to the inordinate dimensions attained by minute-writing, check, and counter check, and the reference backward and forward of papers and proposals in the administrative departments of the Army. The present system urgently requires sim-

plification and acceleration. It is difficult under it to ascertain where responsibility begins and ends, whilst the waste of time and energy involved must operate detrimentally to efficient administration.

The attempt in India to control and regulate the wants of the expedition from Simla was an administrative mistake, and representatives of the Headquarters Staff with wide powers should from the first have been stationed at Bombay, the port of embarkation and disembarkation to and from Mesopotamia.

The Commander-in-Chief himself, or his representatives acting as *liaison* officers, should from time to time have visited Mesopotamia with a view to keeping the Headquarters Staff in touch with the needs of the expedition. In consequence of such want of touch, the Military Authorities at Simla did not appreciate or realise the difficulty of campaigning in Mesopotamia, and from such lack of knowledge failed to make sufficient provision for surmounting the difficulties and drawbacks.

The Commission were not specially directed to make recommendations, but under this heading are the following suggestions —

- 1 The combination of the duties of the Commander-in-Chief in India and Military Member of Council cannot adequately be performed by any one man in time of war, and the existing organisation is at once over-centralised at its head, and cumbersome in its duality below.
- 2 The aim of administrative reform in India should be a devolution of responsibilities and duties from the over-centralised bureaucracy of the Supreme Government at Simla.
3. Changes should be made in the Indian Military Administration enabling the Commander-in-Chief adequately to perform his duties as such
4. The Secretary of State should inquire into the system of promotion of British Officers in India, the system of reserves for native troops, and certain other questions which have been brought before the Commission.

CENSURE OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT

The Commission differentiate between the error of judgment shown by the Indian Government in their advocacy of the advance to Baghdad, which might have happened in any campaign, and their failure adequately to minister to the wants of the forces employed in Mesopotamia.

"This failure," they say, "was persistent and continuous, and practically covered the whole of the period during which the Indian Government were entrusted with the management of the expedition. With the knowledge of the facts which we now possess and of the extent and scope of the preparations of the War Office since they undertook the management of the campaign, it is impossible to refrain from serious censure of the Indian Government for the lack of knowledge and foresight shown in the inadequacy of their preparations and for the lack of readiness to recognise and supply deficiencies. They ought to have known, and with proper touch with the expedition they could have known, what were its wants and requirements. It is true that

their military system was cumbrous and inept. It was, however, within the power of the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief to have established a more effective procedure and a closer touch with the expedition itself."

Except for a few months during which there were serious setbacks, the success of the campaign, as a whole, has been remarkable.

"Up to the date of the advance on Baghdad continuous victory had been achieved. During the last few months the Force has resumed its career of victory. We are of opinion—reviewing the operations as a whole—that it may now be truly asserted that, in the many parts of the world in which the Allied forces have been engaged, no more substantial results or more solid victories have been achieved than those won by the gallantry of the British and Indian Armies on the stricken plains of Mesopotamia."

COMMANDER WEDGWOOD'S REPORT.

Commander Wedgwood's Report, a document of 12 pages, gives no account of the operations or deficiencies in Mesopotamia. It is almost entirely devoted to the attitude of the Indian Government to the war in general, and to the thesis that Lord Hardinge and General Sir Beauchamp Duff "showed little desire to help and some desire actually to obstruct the energetic procedure of the war." Commander Wedgwood stigmatises this attitude as unpatriotic, and declares that it has been a calamity to England. He entirely divests everybody in Mesopotamia and England from blame for the failures in Mesopotamia, and places the whole of such blame on two Indian Officials, the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, and the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Beauchamp Duff. As to this the Commission say:—

"We do not think the evidence before us justifies attaching to Lord Hardinge and Sir Beauchamp Duff alone the blame for the mistakes and shortcomings connected with the Mesopotamia Expedition. We have given reasons for a wider, and, in our judgment, a more equitable apportionment of responsibility."

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE SPEAKER'S CONFERENCE ON ELECTORAL REFORM. (PUBLISHED JANUARY 30.)

THE Speaker introduced the findings of the Conference by recalling the circumstances in which it originated, and quoting from the debate on the Special Register Bill, which led to its formation. Mr. Lowther continued. —

"The members of Parliament and Peers whom I selected appeared to me to be eminently representative of the various shades of political opinion in Parliament and in the country upon the special topics connected with electoral reform. Their numbers were as nearly as possible proportionate to the strength of pre-war parties in the House of Commons. On the question of woman suffrage I endeavoured to obtain an equal division of opinion, so far as it could be ascertained, but many obvious difficulties presented themselves in discovering the views of gentlemen upon that important topic.

“ Eventually the following peers and members of Parliament accepted my invitation :—

“ Lord Salisbury, Earl Grey, Lord Bryce, Lord Gladstone, Lord Burnham, Sir Ryland Adkins, Sir Frederick Banbury, Sir John Bethell, Sir William Bull, Col. James Craig, Col. Page Croft, Mr. Ellis Davies, Mr. W H Dickinson, Sir R. Finlay, Mr. Goldstone, Mr. Laurence Hardy, Mr Maurice Healy, Mr George Lambert, Sir J Larmor, Mr. Macmaster, Mr. J Mooney, Mr. T P. O'Connor, Mr. Peto, Mr Pringle, Sir Harry Samuel, Mr Scanlan, Mr. MacCallum Scott, Sir John Simon, Mr Turton, Mr. Stephen Walsh, Mr. Wardle, and Mr Aneurin Williams

“ Before the Conference met, however, Lord Bryce and Mr. Hardy were obliged through illness to withdraw their acceptances, and Mr Mooney also found himself unable to take part in the proceedings. Their places were taken by Lord Southwark, Sir Robert Williams, and Mr. Brady. Mr W T. Jerred, C B., Assistant Secretary to the Local Government Board, acted as Secretary to the Conference.

“ After our discussion had proceeded for some time, we were so unfortunate as to lose the assistance of Lord Grey, who was prevented by illness from attending, but as I was in constant expectation that he might be able to resume his attendance I did not invite any other gentleman to take his place. Sir Robert Finlay also, on his acceptance of office as Lord Chancellor in your Government, was compelled, to the regret of all his colleagues, to leave us. On December 14 Lord Salisbury, Sir F. Banbury, and Colonel Craig found themselves unable to continue to assist us. Their places were taken by Mr. C B. Stuart-Wortley (now Lord Stuart of Wortley), Mr Touche, and Mr. Aichdale ; and it is perhaps only fair to mention that some of the conclusions of the Conference were arrived at before they became members of it. You will remember that when we had reached this point I consulted you as to the desirability of continuing our labours, and you expressed the desire of his Majesty's Government that the work of the Conference should proceed ”

At the close of his report the Speaker says :—

“ I should like to bear witness to the admirable temper and conciliatory disposition which all the members of the Conference showed in grappling with the difficulties confronting them.”

The following are the recommendations in full :—

I.—REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS.

1. The qualifying period for registration as a Parliamentary elector shall be reduced to six months.
2. There shall be a revision of the register every six months.
3. The qualifying period shall be six months prior to January 15 and July 15 in each year.
4. The time between the preparation and coming into force of the register shall be shortened.
5. The foregoing resolutions (Nos. 2, 3, and 4) shall not apply to Ireland, which, owing to different conditions, may require special treatment.

6 In England and Wales a Registration Officer shall be appointed in every county and borough, who shall be, in the case of a county, the Clerk of the County Council, and, in the case of a borough, the Town Clerk.

7. An appeal from the decision of the Registration Officer shall lie to the County Court

8. In the opinion of the Conference, the cost of registration should be a charge upon the local rates, subject to a contribution of one-half to be made by the State.

II.—REFORM OF THE FRANCHISE

9. (a) Every person of full age, not subject to any legal incapacity, who, for the qualifying period, has resided in any premises, or has occupied for the purpose of his business, profession, or trade, any premises of a clear yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, shall be entitled to be registered as a Parliamentary elector (b) For the purposes of this resolution no change shall be made in the law relating to the joint occupation of business premises (c) A franchise based upon the foregoing qualifications shall be substituted for all existing franchises. Provided that the representation of the universities shall be maintained.

10. The qualification to be registered as a Parliamentary elector shall not be lost by removal to different premises within the same constituency, or from one constituency to another in the same borough or county (including the Administrative County of London), or to different premises in a contiguous county or borough

11. (a) A person shall not vote at a general election in more than one constituency. Provided that a person shall be entitled to one additional vote in another constituency in respect of the occupation of his business premises, or in respect of any qualification he may have as a university voter. (b) For the purpose of this resolution the expression "constituency" means any county, borough, or combination of places, or university or combination of universities, returning a member or members to serve in Parliament, and where a county or borough is divided for the purpose of Parliamentary elections, means a division of the county or borough so divided

12. The law relating to the franchise and registration shall be codified.

III.—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

13. This Conference accepts as governing any scheme of redistribution the principle that each vote recorded shall, as far as possible, command an equal share of representation in the House of Commons.

14. It is desirable that there shall be a Redistribution of Seats in accordance with the following general rules.—

(i) The number of members of the House of Commons for Great Britain shall remain substantially as at present.

(ii) In the application of this principle the information at the disposal of the Conference indicates the taking of 70,000 as the standard unit of population for each member

- (iii) A county or borough (other than the City of London) with a population of less than 50,000 shall cease to have separate representation.
- (iv) A county or borough with a population of 50,000, but less than 70,000, shall continue to have separate representation.
- (v) A municipal borough or urban district with a population not less than 70,000 shall become a separate Parliamentary borough.
- (vi) A county or borough at present returning two members shall not lose a member if the defect in the population is 20,000 or less.
- (vii) A member shall be given for 70,000 and for every multiple of 70,000, and an additional member for any remainder which is not less than 50,000.
- (viii) The boundaries of Parliamentary constituencies shall, as far as practicable, coincide with the boundaries of administrative areas.
- (ix) The City of London shall continue as at present to return two members.

15 Existing boroughs entitled to return two members shall not be divided.

16. Where there are contiguous boroughs which, if formed into a single constituency, would be entitled to return not less than three nor more than five members, it shall be an instruction to the Boundary Commissioners to unite such boroughs into a single constituency. (This resolution would only become applicable in the event of a system of Proportional Representation being adopted, as recommended in a subsequent resolution.)

17. It shall be an instruction to the Boundary Commissioners to take the population as estimated by the Registrar-General for July, 1914, instead of the population according to the Census of 1911

18. It shall be a recommendation to the Boundary Commissioners, after ascertaining local opinion, to segregate as far as possible adjacent industrial and rural areas in forming constituencies within any county.

19. Where, under the application of these rules, a borough loses its right to separate representation in Parliament, it shall be competent for the Commissioners, after having ascertained local opinion on the subject, to combine such borough with any other such borough or boroughs lying within the county, or with any other borough in the same county having separate representation, instead of merging it in the adjacent county division.

20. Where an ancient Parliamentary borough loses its representation, the county division in which the borough becomes merged shall be named after the merged borough.

21. Where districts of burghs in Scotland comprise burghs in different counties, or where under the foregoing rules a Parliamentary borough which is a district of burghs would lose representation, it shall be an instruction to the Boundary Commissioners to consider the desirability of regrouping the burghs or adding neighbouring burghs in the same county, regard being had to their size, to a proper representation of the urban and rural population and to the distribution and pursuits

of such population. Provided that the representation of the county is not thereby affected.

As regards Ireland, the Conference desires to place on record that, on the subject of redistribution, it has carried on its deliberations from the point of view of Great Britain only

IV.—UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATION.

22. (a) The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge shall continue to return two members each the electorate shall be widened, and, in order to secure a proper representation of minorities, each voter shall be allowed to vote for one candidate only. (b) The Universities of Durham, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Bristol, and the University of Wales, shall receive representation; these universities shall be grouped with the University of London so as to form a single constituency returning three members elected on the system of a single transferable vote (c) The combined Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews and of Glasgow and Aberdeen shall also be grouped so as to form a single constituency returning three members under the system of a single transferable vote. (d) As regards all Universities the obtaining of a degree shall be the basis for electoral qualification.

V.—METHOD AND COSTS OF ELECTIONS.

23. (a) A Parliamentary borough which would be entitled on a basis of population to return three or more members shall be a single constituency.

Provided that a constituency entitled to return more than five members shall be divided into two or more constituencies each returning not less than three nor more than five members

(b) The election in any such constituency shall be held on the principle of proportional representation and each elector shall have one transferable vote.

(c) For the purposes of this rule the Metropolis (excluding the City of London) shall be treated as a single area and divided into constituencies returning not less than three nor more than five members

24. (a) At a general election all polls shall be held on one day (b) All nominations shall take place on one day. (c) There shall be an interval of eight days between the day of nomination and the day of poll

25. Returning Officers' charges should be paid by the State on a scale to be fixed by the Treasury.

26. The duties of Returning Officer in England and Wales shall be discharged by a deputy Returning Officer, who shall be in the case of a county the Clerk to the County Council, and in the case of a borough the Town Clerk.

27. (a) Every candidate at the election of a member of Parliament for any county or borough shall be required to deposit with the Returning Officer, at the time of his nomination, the sum of 150*l.* (b) If a candidate is not elected, and the number of votes polled by him does not exceed in the case of a single or double member constituency one-eighth of the total number of voters polling, or in the case of a

constituency returning three or more members one-eighth divided by the number of members to be elected, the deposit instead of being returned to the candidate shall be forfeited to the Treasury (c) For the purposes of this resolution the number of "voters polling" shall mean the number of ballot papers counted other than spoilt ballot papers; and where the election is held under the system of a single transferable vote, the number of "votes polled" by a candidate shall mean the number of votes polled by him as first preferences.

Although the question of candidates' expenses does not appear to be strictly within their terms of reference, the Conference is strongly and unanimously of opinion that the expenditure at present entailed in fighting a contested election is unjustifiable, and should be materially reduced. This, the Conference considers, can only be effectively carried out by an alteration in the maximum amounts at present allowed under the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883. The Conference accordingly resolved that—

28 (a) The following maximum scale of expenses shall be substituted for the maximum scale contained in Part IV of the First Schedule to the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883: Sevenpence per elector in a county. Fivepence per elector in a borough other than a borough returning three or more members. Fourpence per elector in a borough returning three or more members. (b) Where there are joint candidates the total amount of the expenses of the joint candidates shall not exceed one and a half times the scale allowed for a single candidate. (c) A duly nominated candidate, or a number of duly nominated joint candidates shall be allowed one free postage.

In this connexion the Conference has had its attention drawn to a growing and, as it considers, mischievous practice by which, at the time of an election, political and other organisations incur expenditure in the furtherance of the views of particular candidates. The practice is, in the view of the Conference, a contravention of the spirit of the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act. The Conference realises the difficulty of dealing with the matter, but thinks that some amendment of the Act is very desirable, and resolved that—

29 Any person incurring expenditure by holding public meetings or issuing advertisements or publications for the purpose of furthering the election of a candidate shall be guilty of a corrupt practice unless such expenditure is authorised by the candidate and returned as part of his election expenses.

30 The Ballot Act shall be made permanent.

VI.—THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGISTER

The franchise for Local Government purposes is so closely connected with the Parliamentary franchise that the Conference thought it desirable to deal with the matter, and resolved that—

31 (a) In substitution for all existing franchises for Local Government purposes every person who for a period of six months immediately preceding January 15 and July 15 in any year has occupied as owner or tenant any land or premises in a Local Government area in England

and Wales shall be entitled to be registered and to vote as a Local Government elector in that area.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution neither sex nor marriage shall be a disqualification, provided that a husband and wife shall not both be qualified in respect of the same premises

(c) The Conference makes no recommendation with regard to the Local Government franchise in Scotland or Ireland.

VII.—SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

32 (a) It shall be the duty of the Registration Officer to ascertain, as far as possible, the names and addresses of all persons of full age who ordinarily reside in his area, but who are serving in His Majesty's forces, and such persons shall be qualified to be registered and to vote as Parliamentary electors within that area.

(b) In the case of a person who has served in His Majesty's forces during any part of the qualifying period, residence in a constituency for one month immediately preceding January 15 or July 15, as the case may be, shall be a sufficient qualification.

All the resolutions under the foregoing sub-heads I. to VII were agreed to unanimously

VIII.—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Conference decided by a majority that some measure of woman suffrage should be conferred. A majority of the Conference was also of opinion that if Parliament should decide to accept the principle, the most practical form would be to confer the vote in terms of the following resolution :—

33. Any woman on the Local Government Register who has attained a specified age, and the wife of any man who is on that Register if she has attained that age, shall be entitled to be registered and to vote as a Parliamentary elector.

Various ages were discussed, of which 30 and 35 received most favour.

The Conference further resolved that if Parliament decides to enfranchise women, a woman of the specified age who is a graduate of any University having Parliamentary representation shall be entitled to vote as a University elector

IX.—MISCELLANEOUS.

The Conference resolved unanimously that :—

34. The maintenance in any asylum for lunatics or idiots of any person for whose maintenance any other person is responsible shall not disqualify such other person for being registered as a Parliamentary elector.

The following resolutions were passed by a majority :—

35. This Conference, having considered the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress, is of opinion that no person who has received poor relief other than medical relief for less than thirty days in the aggregate during the qualifying

period, shall be disqualified for being registered as a Parliamentary elector *

36 At any election in a single member constituency where there are more than two candidates, the election shall be held on the system of voting known as the alternative vote

37 (a) Provision shall be made to enable any person who is on the Parliamentary Register in any constituency to have his name entered in a List of Absent Voters, and to record his vote as such, provided that he satisfies the Registration Officer that the nature of his employment will render it probable that he will be compelled to be absent from the constituency on the day when the poll will be taken. (b) The Absent Voters' List shall be prepared at the same time as the ordinary Register, and should remain in force during the currency of that Register. (c) A printed ballot paper shall be sent to every voter at the address registered by him for the purpose in such form and manner as will secure the secrecy of the ballot. (d) The ballot paper shall be returnable by post on or before the polling day, accompanied by a statutory declaration of identity in a prescribed form. (e) A person whose name is on the Absent Voters' List shall not be entitled to vote otherwise than as an absent voter.

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART IN 1917.

LITERATURE.

THE scarcity and high price of paper, in combination with the general shortage of labour, tended constantly to increase the difficulties of publishing, and to diminish the output of new books. Public interest in literature seemed, however, to be well maintained, and a considerable number of important works were issued in the course of the year. The following reviews indicate the class of books which attracted most attention.

I. BIOGRAPHY.

Recollections, by John Viscount Morley, O.M., 2 vols. (Macmillan & Co , Ltd) Lord Morley here presents the various experiences and reminiscences of his long career , and the result is equally interesting from the point of view of literature and of politics. The first volume contains Books I., II , and III. Book I., "The Republic of Letters," gives a brief account of Lord Morley's early life. Book II., "Public Life," records his entry into Parliament and a political career. Book III , "Three Years in Ireland," deals with the period 1892-95 ; it ends with the general election of 1895, at which Lord Morley lost his seat at Newcastle

In the second volume Book IV , "Politics and Persons," is succeeded by Book V , "A Short Page in Imperial History"; finally, Book VI., "A Critical Landmark," refers to the King's visit to India, the limitation of the veto of the House of Lords, etc Although the interest of Lord Morley's reminiscences is maintained at a high level throughout the work, it is probable that the features which have attracted most attention are the story of the Home Rule controversies in Vol. I. and the correspondence with Lord Minto in Vol II. The latter consists of a collection of Lord Morley's weekly letters from the India Office to the Viceroy of India. Interesting though they are, it is in some ways regrettable that Lord Minto's letters could not also have been included. Among other admirable features of this important work are the descriptions of distinguished men, such as John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, and many others with whom Lord Morley was on terms of intimate friendship. The "Recollections" constitute one of the most important biographical productions of the year.

The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., begun by Stephen Gwynn, M.P., completed and edited by Gertrude M. Tuckwell, 2 vols. (John Murray). This large work is another of the most important biographies of the year. Politically it covers part of the same ground as is dealt with in Lord Morley's "Reminiscences," described above. The book consists mainly of his own memoirs and correspondence, the former being based on private diaries and letters between the years 1888 and 1892. Sir Charles Dilke was a man of abounding energy and vigour of temperament. His political rise was rapid; on all sides his great abilities were recognised; and he was marked out as a future Prime Minister of Great Britain. At the height of his success, the tragedy occurred which ruined all his future prospects. He was dragged into the Divorce Courts, but dismissed from the case, owing to the complete absence of any evidence to inculpate him. Not content with this issue, however, he carried the proceedings forward, in the hope that his innocence might be proved. Owing to difficulties of legal procedure, he was unable to obtain a fair opportunity of setting forth his defence, and the resulting verdict amounted, as far as he was concerned, to one of "non-proven." It thus came about that a deplorable tragedy of private life exercised a large influence on subsequent British politics, for one of the most brilliant politicians of the time was thus suddenly removed from the high sphere of influence which he must have occupied. The book has been well written and edited; and its interest is great both on political and personal grounds.

Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton. Edited with an Introduction by John Neville Figgis, Litt.D., and Reginald Vere Laurence, M.A., vol. 1. (Longmans, Green & Co.). This volume is chiefly occupied with Lord Acton's correspondence with Cardinal Newman, Lady Blennerhassett, and Mr. Gladstone. In addition to this general correspondence, one section of the book is devoted to Lord Acton's early letters, and another to his ecclesiastical correspondence. The fact is clearly brought out how much of Acton's subsequent development was due to the early influence of Dollinger. The keynote of his political convictions was the doctrine of liberty, which he dissociated altogether from the defence of property, with which it is so often confused. As the editors remark, freedom was to Acton "the governing principle of true statesmanship, the determining element in political thought, the criterion of all constitutions." He thus represented a political theory, which found much advocacy in Victorian times, but has been little considered in the new century. He drew from history lessons similar to those which were drawn by Herbert Spencer from philosophy; for Spencer also looked upon freedom as the touchstone by which all political questions were to be decided. It was this political philosophy, which drew him towards Gladstone, to a still greater extent than it did Spencer. This volume is full of interest, both historical and psychological. It has been admirably edited, and gives an excellent insight into the ideals which dominated the Victorian era.

The Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne, by Edmund Gosse, C.B. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.), was one of the most notable biographies of the

year, and will no doubt remain the standard life of Swinburne. Previous to its publication, the only memoir of the poet's life, which had previously been published, was contributed by Mr. Gosse to the "Dictionary of National Biography," in 1912; and the present work is built up on the skeleton of that article. Mr. Gosse has succeeded admirably in his interesting task; for he has the advantage not only of high literary accomplishments, but of having had a personal acquaintance with Swinburne for a period of more than forty years. He contradicts once again the current belief that Swinburne disliked Eton. He speaks much of Swinburne's physical courage, and his capacity to hold his own against other boys. On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that Swinburne had no liking at all for Oxford, and it may well be believed that his strong republican sentiments found an unfavourable environment in that University. Mr. Gosse prints a short but characteristic letter from Swinburne to Lord Curzon later in life, when the poet declined the offer of an honorary degree from his old University. Mr. Gosse's personal account of Swinburne is exceptionally interesting and well done. His very short stature, his large head, his aristocratic appearance, made him everywhere appear a remarkable personality. Mr. Gosse assumes in his biography that the reader already has a considerable knowledge of Swinburne. He refrains, for instance, from stating the reason which led to his retirement from the Arts Club, although that event is of much interest, and seems to have affected Swinburne's opinion of corporate institutions generally. It is curious to note that Swinburne in early life had always wished to be a soldier, and was precluded therefrom partly by the smallness of his stature. It is obvious that this curious personality, with his republican views, and all the strange characteristics of genius, must have been highly unsuited to a military life. In all respects this important biography justifies the high anticipations which had been raised by the interest of the subject and by the literary reputation of the author.

Herbert Spencer, by Hugh Elliot (Messrs Constable & Co., Ltd.), is one of the "Makers of the Nineteenth Century" series, of which Basil Williams is the general editor. Mr. Elliot has long been known as one of the leading exponents of Spencerian philosophy, and this book contains an outline of the opinions set forth in Spencer's works, as well as a narrative of his life. As the author remarks, men of thought live in their writings, not in their doings, and their lives tend to be barren of incident. Mr. Elliot points out in the Introduction that the study of Spencer's sociology is extraordinarily necessary and apposite at the present time. For a quarter of a century before the outbreak of the war, political development had taken the direction opposite to the Spencerian principle of the liberty of the individual. The rights of the State over the individual were being steadily extended. The war has caused this collectivist policy to be pushed suddenly to extreme limits, and the State "has now overtly proclaimed its complete authority over the persons and the incomes of every individual subject to its control." The process has gone so far that very many persons now take the absolutism of the State for granted, and the very idea of freedom has been lost. The advocates of democracy condemn with honest fervour the tyrannies of

autocrats and aristocrats, and they prate of liberty and use the name of freedom, but what they have in mind, and what they admire and would establish over all the world, is not liberty, nor anything in the least resembling liberty, but a system of majority tyranny, the literal enslavement of minorities. This book comes as an antidote to these doctrines of State-idolatry. The war has brought the issue to a head, and in Mr. Elliot's words, we must decide the question, "Is this a satisfactory social policy or is it not?" The author indicates his own opinion: "It is useless now to sneer at liberty as a discredited doctrine. Europe may have abandoned it, but see the result! The social philosophy which can take effect like this is unquestionably and irremediably false."

The book consists of thirteen chapters, of which the second and third deal with Spencer's life and character respectively. Chapters IV to XII. describe the different sections of the philosopher's work—sociology, ethics, metaphysics, evolution, biology, psychology, and education. The exposition of the philosophy is lucid, though necessarily very brief, but probably the best, and certainly the most original chapter in the book, is that dealing with Spencer's character. This is not surprising, for Mr. Elliot is himself a psychologist, and it is clearly advantageous to have a biography written by a professed student of that science. The author's comments in this chapter are both informing and suggestive. For instance, the following passage which has reference to the marked limitations of Spencer's character in certain directions is worthy of much consideration: "It is a vice of the present age to insist that a man shall come up to a certain all-round standard in mental and moral qualities. If he falls in certain respects below that standard, it is held insufficient that he should soar high above it in other respects. As our social policy has drifted for long in the direction of dead-level equality, so there is a constant tendency, in judging men, to require a certain general conformity in all directions before we feel free to admire qualities of the highest rarity and excellence. Yet this attitude is irrational for the excessive development of a few mental faculties almost inevitably causes under-development of others. In proportion as we require conformity to the prevailing standard, and in proportion as that standard is high and far-reaching, we cut away the basis of greatness and of genius."

Diaz, by David Hannay (Constable & Co., Ltd.). Mr. David Hannay has made an interesting addition to the excellent series, "Makers of the Nineteenth Century," with the life of President Diaz. He gives a graphic account of the Mexican Republic, and he shows that Diaz was, without doubt, a born leader of men. And if it is true that national emergencies create great men, it may be that Diaz was able to rise to the great opportunity occasioned by the fate of Maximilian. For, by strength of character and an aptitude for administration which he undoubtedly possessed, he was able for a time, at all events, to dominate an unruly people and to enable them to obtain the rest from strife which they so sorely needed. Up to a certain point he achieved marvels, though the end of his long career did not fulfil the promise of its commencement. He did great things for his country, and "brought it," says Mr. Hannay, "to a more respectable prominence and to a greater

prosperity than it had enjoyed since its original conquest by the Spaniards." That Diaz was unsuccessful in the end, and that he was unable to assure a permanence to his works is undeniable, "perhaps because he was not great man enough, but more surely because he had not to his hand the elements with which more could be done." Mr. Hannay's history of the country of Mexico is delightful reading, and it may truly be said that since Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico" it would be difficult to find a work on Mexican history which is so full of varied interest.

Jan Smuts. *Being a Character Sketch of Gen. The Hon. J. C. Smuts, K.C., M.L.A., Minister of Defence, Union of South Africa*, by N. Levi. With twelve illustrations (Longmans, Green & Co.). The good work done in Africa by General Smuts has made him a very prominent figure, and an account of his life is most acceptable at the present time. Although Mr. Levi calls his book a "Character Sketch," it is in truth a volume very tightly packed with events which very closely follow each other. Jan Christian Smuts was born in 1870. His education commenced at a modest scholastic establishment called "De Ark," and later he went to the Victoria College at Stellenbosch and from there to Cambridge. Mr. Levi gives extracts from some of Smuts' early writings, lectures on Law, etc. General Smuts has always taken a deep personal interest in the welfare of his country, particularly in the Education question, on which subject he holds strong views. The author points out the part Smuts played in the Boer War; and later on his work for the Union of South Africa. The introduction of Chinese labour Smuts considered disastrous, and in a speech at Kimberley he said, "We shall not rest until the last Chinaman has left the shores of South Africa." The parts of the book which will interest most readers are the chapters which deal with the pro-German rebellion excited by Maritz and supported by De Wet, and the campaign still in progress, which will settle the fate of Prussian rule in Africa. General Smuts' character has been admirably summed up by General Botha in a Reuter interview, when he said: "Nobody can appreciate sufficiently the great work General Smuts has done. It has been greater than any other man's throughout this unhappy period. He was at his post day and night. His brilliant intellect, his calm judgment, his amazing energy, his undaunted courage, have been assets of inestimable value to the Union in her hour of trial."

The Life of Sir Colin C. Scott-Moncrieff, 1836-1916. Edited by his Niece, M. A. Hollings (John Murray). The life of Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff has been admirably edited by his niece. It is a most interesting record of a long and busy life; and the Royal Engineers must be proud of counting so notable a man among the members of their illustrious corps. Scott-Moncrieff went to India in 1858, and did good work for nearly two years in Oudh. and the next twenty years of his life were spent principally in the important work of Indian irrigation. Subsequently he was promoted to be Superintending Engineer of the Ganges Canal; and he worked unsparingly at the great task entrusted to him. He spent his leave during this period studying the irrigation systems of Northern Italy and Spain. In 1883 Scott-Moncrieff was offered by Lord Dufferin the Directorship of Irrigation in Egypt, and he accomplished great things,

in spite of many obstacles, during nine years of office in that country, and Lord Cromer said of him that "no Englishman employed in the Egyptian service during the early days of the occupation did more to make the name of England respected than Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff." Being a thorough Scotsman, his appointment, later on, as Under-Secretary for Scotland, was most congenial. And in 1901-3, as perhaps the greatest specialist of his day, his services were again required as President of the Indian Irrigation Commission. In his later life he still loved to travel in distant lands; and his letters during his long absences are good reading. The whole "mosaic," as the Editor quaintly names it, forms a volume of the highest interest.

Madame Adam (Juliette Lamber), *La Grande Française*. From Louis Philippe to 1917, by Winifred Stephens (Chapman & Hall, Ltd.). Miss Winifred Stephens has written an excellent account of the life of a very notable Frenchwoman, Mme Adam, or, as she is very appropriately called, *La Grande Française*. The book is well worth reading, and it covers a period extending from Louis Philippe to 1917. Mme Adam was a keen politician, and she took an active part in the politics of her own country. Her famous salon was frequented by the most notable politicians and ministers of her day, and the author mentions her intimate friendship with Gambetta and Thiers. Her experiences of some fifty years, for she had "lived through the Revolution of 1848, the Coup d'Etat of 1851, the agony of the siege of Paris, the civil war of the Commune, and two invasions of her beloved patrie," must have rendered her conversation of absorbing interest to those of her acquaintance whom she honoured with her reminiscences. *La Grande Française* had no good word for Bismarck, nor had she any love for his country. The chapter which deals with the Franco-Prussian War is of special interest at this time. Mme Adam's interests were many and various, and she must have possessed unusual energy of mind and body. She was deeply interested in literature, and for many years edited a fortnightly magazine entitled *La Nouvelle Revue*. She numbered among her friends many litterateurs of note, including, says Miss Stephens, "Georges Sand, Flaubert, Victor Hugo, Alphonse Daudet, Pierre Loti, Paul Bourget, and Maurice Barrès." The book is full of diverting incidents, and Miss Stephens is to be congratulated on presenting such an unusually interesting Memoir to the public.

Alfred Lyttelton, an account of his life, by Edith Lyttelton. With photogravure frontispiece and other illustrations (Longmans, Green & Co.). Alfred Lyttelton was a man of great capacities, besides which, as Mr. Balfour says in his foreword, he possessed "the unique charm" which made an "irresistible appeal to every man and woman whom he met." We are much indebted to Mrs. Lyttelton for an interesting account of her husband's life. The book is more a family history than a political record; it is divided into three parts. The first deals with Alfred Lyttelton's youth and early manhood, his school and college life; his extraordinary proficiency at games. The whole of the fourth chapter is devoted to this subject. "His cricket years ranged from 1872 to 1887 . . . he captained Eton in the last year. From 1876 to 1879 he played for Cambridge." The same chapter gives many records of his

first-class cricket, and his achievements at racquets and tennis which were equally remarkable ; "no one who ever lived," says his biographer, "can have risen to the top of any game quite so fast as Alfred did at tennis ; after he had played a month he was the best undergraduate player at Cambridge." The story of Mr. Lyttelton's marriage and the death of his first wife, followed so shortly by that of his baby son, is told with exquisite pathos. Many of the letters describing his meeting with notable persons, such as Ruskin, Carlyle, Gladstone, etc., are most entertaining. The second part of the book commences with Mr. Lyttelton's second marriage, and relates events in his political career, his work in South Africa, etc., and the last part deals with his work as Colonial Secretary and for various "public causes" which he undertook "inside and outside Parliament." Mrs. Lyttelton shows many sidelights on the character of her husband, whose death in 1913 was a grievous loss to his country—for besides his great usefulness, he was "a man greatly beloved."

Recollections, Literary and Political, by J. H. Balfour-Browne, K.C. (Constable & Co., Ltd.) It is safe to say that Mr. Balfour-Browne's new book will be received with satisfaction, judging by the popularity of his previous work, "Forty Years at the Bar," and his readers will find in his new publication that the many amusing and often racy anecdotes, which he relates so breezily, will make some otherwise tedious half hours pass pleasantly by the winter fire. Though there is not much particularly remarkable about his "Recollections, Literary and Political," yet reminiscences are nearly always interesting when they are told in a manner which does not bore ; and Mr. Balfour-Browne, who has obviously made a deep study of human nature, writes always with great verve and humour, and his reader is carried with interest on to the end. His descriptions of early events, notably at the Edinburgh University, and his remarks about Professor Blackie are full of interest, while his comment on an address delivered by Carlyle when he was Lord Rector of Edinburgh University, and on various other lectures, are most entertaining. Mr. Balfour-Browne is able to write on a variety of subjects with equal ease, and many of his criticisms on things literary and artistic are worthy of note.

II WAR BOOKS

The Russian Offensive, by Stanley Washburn (Constable & Co., Ltd.), is one of the best descriptions of the war in what was, for many months, the more important of the two major theatres of military operations. The offensive to which the title refers is the great drive in Volhynia and Galicia which General Brusilov carried out in June, July, and August, 1916. Mr. Washburn was the special correspondent of the London *Times* with the Russian Armies, and the book is described as "the Third Volume of 'Field Notes from the Russian Front,' embracing the period from June 5 to September 1, 1916." The author states that these first-hand impressions of the Russian Front are republished in the volume just as they were originally written, and he apologises for the lack of literary finish due to the fact that the articles were written

under disturbing conditions, often within the sound of the guns. The occasional evidences of haste do not require much apology, however. A great feature of the book is the splendid series of illustrations which have been reproduced from photographs by G. H. Mews of the London *Daily Mirror*. The articles were written under the influence of the natural exhilaration which the author felt when he saw Austrian prisoners being marched to the rear in tens of thousands, and they are therefore, as we now know, unduly optimistic in tone. Brusilov's offensive brought about large gains of territory and the capture of 400,000 prisoners, but it failed to reach its main strategic objective, which was the railway-junction of Kovel. Mr. Washburn deals in an interesting manner with both the strategic and tactical aspects of the operations and with the human side of the war in the East. He says repeatedly that the Austro-Hungarian troops wage war in a much more humane and chivalrous manner than the Germans, and that there was a notorious absence of bitterness between the Russian and Austrian soldiers. The story told in this book will always be memorable as the tale of the heroic, if unavailing, attempt of the Tsar's generals and armies to reverse the terrible disasters of the Warsaw campaign of 1915.

With the New Army on the Somme, by Frederick Palmer (John Murray), is a book which is designed to show up the human aspects of the war rather than the chess-board problems of the conflict. There is here little reference to strategy and not much even to tactics. But the feelings of a sympathetic war-correspondent and the sights witnessed immediately behind the firing-line are vividly portrayed. Mr. Palmer was the accredited American correspondent at the British Front, and having had previous experience of war (his book "With Kuroki in Manchuria" is well known), he possessed both the opportunities and the experience necessary to the formation of sound opinions upon the behaviour of the British troops in those prolonged and almost unimaginably exacting operations which we call the Battle of the Somme. One of the most impressive parts of the book is the description of the author's own feelings as he waited in tense suspense for the hour of 7.30 A.M. on July 1, the time fixed for the great initial assault by the British infantry, fully realising what it meant to throw frail human bodies against the monstrous engines of destruction which still, in spite of the British bombardment, belched death from the German defences. There are things which happen on battlefields which find no place in books such as this, but some of the incidents described are quite sufficiently horrible. Mr. Palmer eulogises the cool temperament and brave bearing of the men of the New Armies. He relates how one very young officer, speaking of the repulse of an attack from which much had been expected and in which he had been wounded, quietly remarked, "It did not go well this time"; and how, on the same occasion, a private, with equal candour and equally undismayed, just said, "We must try again, sir." The author reverts again and again to the courage displayed by the British troops, though he also pays a tribute to the bravery of the "Boche." And he makes the comment that "on July 1st a question was answered for anyone who had been in the Manchurian War. He learned that those bred in the

sight of cathedrals in the civilisation of the epic poem can surpass without any inspiration of oriental fatalism or religious fanaticism the courage of the land of Shintoism and Bushido."

Sea Power and Freedom. A Historical Study, by Gerard Fiennes (Skeffington & Son, Ltd.). Mr Gerard Fiennes has written a book entitled "Sea Power and Freedom." The volume is compiled from a series of lectures which the author delivered on the meaning and function of sea power; and he tells us, it was while revising these lectures for publication that the idea occurred to him of emphasising by a book the important fact that the maritime peoples have taken an enormous share in establishing the freedom of the human race. Mr. Fiennes is a well-known contributor to the Press on naval matters. He has made a deep study of his subject, and is obviously of the school of Mahan. In the course of his work the author points out that "It is true, all through history, that the nations which have had to exchange their products for food-stuffs have been the great sea powers. Phoenicia, Greece, Venice, Holland, Britain stand on the one hand, ancient Egypt, Babylonia, France, and the United States on the other." The book will interest lovers of the sea besides being uncommonly instructive. It is perhaps a trifle condensed for so great a subject, but it is written in Mr. Fiennes' usual invigorating style which makes it delightful reading.

Sixteen Months in Four German Prisons, by Henry C. Mahoney (Sampson Low & Co., Ltd.). Mr Mahoney has written a book which is full of interest to everybody; and in which he describes his life and sufferings during sixteen weary months which he spent being moved about between four German prisons. We are accustomed by this time to hear tales of German cruelty and callousness, so that Mr Mahoney's recital of his wrongs only adds further proof of the limitless brutality of these people. At the time of the declaration of hostilities, the author was in Berlin, and in trying to make his way to Russia was arrested as a spy. He was subsequently tried for espionage with twenty-two others, and was one of the lucky three who escaped with their lives. It is difficult to know whether the so-called trials are conducted with any legality, or even if the accused are allowed a qualified lawyer to defend them, but be that as it may, the other twenty unfortunates were found guilty of the charge preferred against them, and their sentence was carried out without delay. Mr. Mahoney relates in detail the fearful conditions of prison life in Germany, the indignities and cruelties inflicted on the often innocent prisoners; and such an account at first hand will be valuable evidence against the German when he shall, before long, be called to account for these minor atrocities, as well as his other greater crimes. We cannot enter into many details here, but Mr. Mahoney tells his story with a force and interest which cannot fail to strike his readers.

The Wonder Book of the Navy. Edited by Mr. Harry Golding (Ward, Lock & Co., Ltd.) Mr. H. Golding has edited a book which is an important addition to educational works for both boys and girls. Besides its instructive qualities, it is extremely interesting and well illustrated by sixteen coloured plates and more than 250 illustrations. It points out that to the Navy is greatly due the safety and prosperity of the British Empire. And what makes the book of particular value

at the present time is the thorough explanation it gives of the various branches of the Naval Service, and their works, especially in time of war, when the important work done by torpedoes, submarines, mine-layers, etc., should be better understood by all. The chapters which treat of the Naval Air Service are written by experts and are well worth perusal. The volume is indeed an excellent history of the Navy from early times, and is to be highly recommended.

Belgium Under the German Heel, by M. Odon Halasi (Cassell & Co., Ltd.). Though written by a German ally, the author of "Belgium Under the German Heel" is unable and perhaps undesirous to hide the facts which have so forcibly obtruded themselves upon his notice during several months which he spent in Belgium. M. Odon Halasi with the co-operation of another of his countrymen has published his observations and criticisms regarding the country and its people under German rule. With the consent of the German Government he obtained access to the Central Press Bureau at Brussels, where he obtained much valuable information, statistics, etc., that is jealously kept from the general public. But his chief source of information was his own observation. Though a Hungarian and therefore fighting on the German side, his sympathy seems, perhaps in spite of himself, to have gone out to the unhappy people who while suffering every indignity and insult at the hands of their oppressors, "give one," he says, "the impression of princes in the garb of slaves." M. Halasi writes of their social life, their economies, their misery, for he cannot but note the brutal methods of the Germans who tread rough-shod over their unhappy victims, who, bereft of their friends and relations, deprived of all their worldly goods, hungry always, and half-starved very often, work hopefully on waiting for their deliverance. The volume has been translated into English, and is well worth reading by those who value a foreign opinion of the martyrdom of the Belgian people, and the state of the country under Prussian rule.

A Rumanian Diary: 1915, 1916, 1917, by Lady Kennard (W. Heinemann). Lady Kennard has written a very interesting account of her experiences during three years in Rumania, 1915-17. The book is written in diary form, though the end of it, the author tells us, is compiled from notes furnished by correspondents after she had left the country. It is not easy to be very discreet in a diary, and very interesting at the same time, yet Lady Kennard's book by no means lacks interest, though it very rightly lacks proper names. She relates events of her everyday life before Rumania joined the Entente; and subsequently, when the country was at war, her work in one of the hospitals which was systematically bombed. And when it became necessary to evacuate Bukarest, she describes her flight to Jassy and the terrible privations and miseries she endured in that city rendered fulsome by the overcrowding which was so great that diseases of all sorts soon began to make their appearance among the refugees. Yet, in spite of these distressing experiences, the author is able to relate many anecdotes of an uncomfortable nature, with a verve which, at this distance, renders them most amusing. Lady Kennard points out the intense ignorance of the Rumanian peasantry, and their utter inability to grasp

the political condition of Europe at this time, or to see the advisability of their country coming into the war on the side of the Entente Powers; and when at last, quite unprepared for war, they joined the Allies, they looked to Russia to advance beside them, and further, to supply them with the necessary munitions and equipment; but that Russia proved herself a broken reed is now a matter of history, though one cannot help feeling that Lady Kennard has kept back much that she knows of interest, for reasons of prudence; her book is very well worth reading.

Letters from France, by C. E. W. Bean (Cassell & Co., Ltd.). "Letters from France" is a book of unusual interest. The author, Mr C E W. Bean, is an official War Correspondent of the Australian Commonwealth, and therefore he has had great opportunities of collecting material at first hand, which, coupled with his genius for description, makes his book a valuable addition to the military literature of the war. He has been with the Australians at the Dardanelles as well as in France, so that his experience covers a wide range. His book does not profess to be a history of the part which the Australians have played in the war, it is chiefly a collection of the more important events which came within the radius of his observation; some of the most notable of which were the battles at Pozières Ridge, Mousquet Farm, etc. Pozières Ridge Mr Bean considers the severest engagement they have yet taken part in. Not the least interesting part of the book is the description of the life of the Australian soldier in the trenches and in the camp. Many readers besides Australians will enjoy the book, and those who have noted at Salisbury Plain, or other camps, the splendid physique of these overseas men, will understand better what their powers of endurance and their bravery can be in battle. The great part they have played in this war is already well known. They came eagerly to help the mother country in her hour of need and they have taken willingly their share in the Great Sacrifice.

III. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL.

A new history of modern Germany is being written by Sir Adolphus William Ward under the title **Germany: 1815-1890** (Cambridge University Press); and during the year the second volume of this work, dealing with the period 1852-71, was published. The first volume was reviewed in the ANNUAL REGISTER of 1916, and as then stated the book does not fall into the category of the ordinary partisan war-books on Germany, but is cold impartial history, as one would expect from Sir A. W. Ward. The book is one of the Cambridge Historical Series. Since this volume covers the period of three wars, Sir A. W. Ward sought the assistance of Professor Spenser Wilkinson, Chichele Professor of Military History at Oxford, and the latter authority contributes the account of the military operations of the Schleswig-Holstein, Austro-Prussian, and Franco-German wars.

The book covers the period beginning with the definite defeat of the revolutionary attempt to form a united Liberal democratic Germany, and ending with the consummation of Bismarck's militarist movement towards what is called, inaptly, the union of Germany. In the 'fifties the political condition of Germany was a restoration of the regime which

had existed from 1815 to the outbreak of the abortive revolutionary movement in 1848. The undemocratic and cumbrous machinery of the old German confederation was restored, and this continued to exist until the definite split between Prussia and Austria in 1866. The account of the Schleswig-Holstein episode is one of the best parts of the book. The two German great Powers undoubtedly had a good case, in equity if not in law, as against Denmark, but the subsequent proceedings of the Prussian Government presented that power in an ugly and sinister light. The great majority of the population of the duchies were Germans, not Scandinavians, and in that sense the first war was really a war of liberation, and the tendency to sympathise with the Danes which foreigners often display is merely the natural but irrational feeling for the smaller and weaker belligerent which onlookers usually harbour. But although the people of the duchies wanted their full rights as German citizens, they had no desire to become Prussian subjects, and in the war that followed the liberation of Schleswig-Holstein the reader's sympathies go to Austria, and to Bavaria, Saxony, Wurtemberg, Hanover, and the rest who rallied to her aid. The defeat of Austria finally ruptured the German Confederation, and from the narrower federation then formed, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, Austria, Luxemburg, and Liechtenstein were excluded—the last three permanently, of course.

In his account of the political aspects of the Franco-Prussian quarrel the author comes to conclusions which are anti-Prussian, without being pro-French. The alteration of the Ems telegram shows up Bismarck's character in a cynical light, even on the most charitable hypothesis. Professor Wilkinson's descriptions of the three wars are admirably lucid. Sir A. W. Ward gives his readers a wealth of accurate historical detail, but he somewhat fails to present the story as a whole. The reader sees the trees, and sees them very clearly, but he is not given much assistance towards obtaining a view of the wood.

It is curious that the events here described should have come to be known as the union of Germany, for it is equally true to describe these happenings as the rupture of Germany. The territory marked on the maps as "Germany" since 1871 is not the Germany either of history, or of existing fact—it is part of Germany—with a fragment of hapless Poland attached. It is as though our northern, midland, and eastern counties agreed to exclude Wessex, and arrogated to themselves the name of England. It is true that the states leagued around Berlin were more closely united to each other than they had ever been before, but they were also more completely separated from the remainder of Germany, that is, German-Austria, than they had ever been before. We have here one of the great problems of European politics. One cannot regret that it exists, one can hardly think it unfortunate that Bismarck's achievement was so utterly incomplete. It is incomplete still, for the talk of "Mitteleuropa" is still only talk, and it would obviously not enhance the dignity of the younger Kaiser if it became anything else. All this is probably fortunate, not only for Europe, but for Germany, because an important part of Germany escaped, and has still largely escaped, the influence of Bismarck.

of the most informative of the many books on the Russian Empire which were published during the year. The book consists of a reprint of certain lectures delivered at Cambridge in August, 1916, during the Summer Meeting arranged by the Local Examinations and Lectures Syndicate. The main subject of study at the meeting was "Russia and Poland," and it is a selection of the more important lectures then delivered which is here reprinted. The book is edited by J. D. Duff, and the following are the six essays included (1) "The War and Balkan Politics" (2) "The Representative System in Russia." These two chapters are by M. Paul Milioukov (Miliukoff), the famous leader of the Liberal Party in the Duma. (3) "Past and Present of Russian Economics," by Peter Struve. (4) "Poland, Old and New," by Roman Dmowski (5) "The Nationalities of Russia," by Harold Williams (6) "The Development of Science and Learning in Russia," by A. S. Lappo-Danilevsky. M. Milioukov's second essay is extremely good, and contains an amount of information about the Parliamentary institutions of old Russia which it is difficult or impossible to find elsewhere in the English language. M. Dmowski's article on Poland is chiefly historical: the account of the pre-partition period is excellent, but in describing the country in post-partition times attention is concentrated upon Russian and Prussian Poland (the latter misleadingly called "German Poland"), and little is said of the autonomous Polish State of Galicia. Mr Harold Williams's article is a light popular sketch of the chief nationalities of the Empire, and is not intended for serious students of ethnography, it contains, however, much information which will be useful to the English public, who are extraordinarily ignorant of Eastern Europe. Owing to the intervention of the Revolution, the reader of this book almost has the sensation that he is perusing eighteenth-century history,—the whole atmosphere is now so utterly changed.

Twentieth Century France, by M. Betham-Edwards (Chapman & Hall, Ltd.). In this work Miss Betham-Edwards, who is one of the first authorities on France, describes the splendour of twentieth-century France, alike on its moral and intellectual side "as shown in its philosophers, critics, scientists, and poets," as well as by her enormous territorial expansion. Miss Betham-Edwards also treats of France on its ethical, literary, and educational sides. Her book contains a wealth of information, and the chapters dealing with the philosophers, writers, and scientists who have helped to make France what she is to-day are most fascinating and instructive. The picture of the gentle unassuming naturalist M. Fabre—"The Virgil of the Insect World"—and his work is a very vivid one. The extracts which Miss Betham-Edwards has rendered into English from the works of the brothers Rosny on prehistoric romance fill one with a desire to read more of their works. And then comes a short account of the marvels of the "world beneath our feet" which have been revealed by M. Martel; this most interesting account of the discovery of the monster caves, underground rivers and lakes, help one to realise the unusual spirit of adventure which animates the "Columbus of the nether world." Miss Edwards then passes to a discussion of what she calls "book-mindedness" of this period, and she maintains that "no former epoch has produced such masterpieces in criticism, erudition, philosophy, and

science, and no other country produces so many writers of the first rank in these fields," and in a most inspiring chapter she proves her statement. The chapter given to "Characteristics of French Life," and to "Frenchwomen," are delightful reading, and one is conscious that the Frenchwoman with her rare ability and studied efficiency can teach us many things besides how to dress in perfect taste. Exception must be taken, however, to the remarks about the training and education of the smaller children. In England the small child has a freer and more natural training, and the education provided in the various Kindergartens could nowhere be bettered. The last part of the book is taken up with discussions of social and political problems and speculations as to what the future will unfold. Miss Edwards has given a most fascinating and true picture of the France which she has lived in for many years, and which she has studied with painstaking care and rare insight from every aspect, and her conclusions as to the future of this great country should have great influence.

The Expansion of Europe: The Culmination of Modern History, by Ramsay Muir (Constable & Co., Ltd.). Professor Muir, who is Professor of Modern History at Manchester, has written a series of essays entitled "The Culmination of Modern History"; of these, the two first, "Nationalism and Internationalism," have already been published in one volume, and have met with well-merited success, and a large circle of readers will welcome his third essay of the series, "The Expansion of Europe." Professor Muir explains Imperialism in its various aspects at some length. And he then deals with the rise and fall of Spanish power; and the competition between the English, French, and Dutch during the seventeenth century. In a most interesting chapter Professor Muir points out the position which the British Empire holds among the other World States. And the last chapters of the book treat of the attitude of Germany in 1900-14 and of events which led up to the declaration of the great European War and the probable results of its final issue. The author's firm belief in the stability of the British Empire, resting on the foundation of her own laws of self-government rather than force, is truly invigorating, for he says, "to all alike, to one quarter of the inhabitants of the world, it has meant the establishment of the Reign of Law, and of the Liberty which can only exist under its shelter." Professor Muir's book is a valuable addition to the year's historical literature.

The Coming Democracy, by Herman Fernau (Constable & Co., Ltd.). A book advocating republicanism is not surprising in these days; but coming from the hands of a German, it is significant. The present war, indeed all wars, Herr Fernau urges, are caused by a system of government which sacrifices the people to the private advantage of a dynasty. He points out that by a victorious foreign war the ruler of such a dynasty gains the dual object of strengthening his power and suppressing his own people, whose chances of greater political freedom are thereby necessarily prevented from developing as rapidly as they would in times of peace. Hence the only cure for such a form of government is its complete overthrow in war. Herr Fernau wrote "The Coming Democracy" before the Revolution in Russia took place, and published it

at Berne at the end of February, so that it is clear his judgment in regard to dynasties could not have been biased by that important event. In a previous work, "Because I am a German," he has already attacked Prussian autocracy; it is therefore not to be wondered at that he published his works outside the Fatherland.

The popularity of Herr Fernau's previous book will assure him many readers of his notable work "The Coming Democracy," which deals with a problem uppermost in the minds of all the governors and people of the nations.

La France de l'Est, by P. Vidal de la Blache, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris (Librairie Armand Colin, Paris). The ultimate fate of Alsace-Lorraine is a matter of great moment not only to France, but to the whole of Europe, and in his interesting book, "La France de l'Est" M. Vidal de la Blache emphasises the unqualified attitude of his country on the subject of the future of these States. The importance of these Provinces to Germany cannot be exaggerated, for they give her practically the entire control of the shipping on the Rhine. Free navigation of the Rhine, so important to other countries as well as Germany, is supposed to be guaranteed, yet this guarantee, the author points out, has become virtually null and void owing to Germany's possession of both banks of the river. Germany gets something like four-fifths of her iron from French Lorraine, and what is of still greater value to her, great quantities of coal, so as M. Vidal de la Blache very truly remarks, in the event of the Rhine-Danube canal being finished, Germany would gain enormous economic power, and would in effect become "the great dispenser of coal on the Continent." And, if the German design of developing this pleasing state of things as far as Calais were to be put into practice, it would give her practically the entire monopoly of coal and so seal the economic fate of France. The book deals with many other interesting and important features relating to Alsace and Lorraine, such as the exodus of the French and the immigration of the Germans into these Provinces, and is an important study of racial and geographical distribution of this part of the country.

The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, by R. W. Seton-Watson (Constable & Co, Ltd.) Mr. Seton-Watson is too well known as an authority on ethnological subjects relating to the near East to require an introduction. His previous works on the Southern Slav are much appreciated by students of the Balkan States, who will welcome an important addition to the literature on the Eastern Question in Mr. Seton-Watson's new book, "The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans." It contains four good maps and a very complete list of authorities which materially adds to its value. The first half of the book treats of events since the foundation of the Balkan League; and the chapter on the Turkish Conquest and the States under Ottoman rule is interesting but too short, and the same criticism applies to the chapter on the Decline of the Turkish Empire. The author then briefly relates the struggle of the Serbs for their independence, as also the main points of the revolution in Greece, 1821-63.

The pages devoted to Rumania are of special interest and confirm

Mr Seton-Watson's reputation for erudition. The chapter on the "Young Turkish Revolution" is somewhat obscure and disappointing owing to its brevity. In the second part of the book Mr Seton-Watson describes the Balkan wars and the Balkan League, the matter is much less condensed and does not suffer from the brevity we have noticed in the first part. But the Publisher notes that a call to arms prevented the author from finishing his work which concludes with the armistice of July 30, 1913.

The Great Problems of British Statesmanship, by J. Ellis Barker (John Murray) Mr Ellis Barker has woven a collection of his articles, selected from various writings which have already appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* and other magazines, into a most interesting book entitled "The Great Problems of British Statesmanship." The first part of the book relates to European Diplomacy, Constantinople, Asiatic Turkey, Austria-Hungary, and Poland, it is full of valuable information, and the author claims in his article on Poland, that "much of the material given in the following pages has never been printed and has been taken from the original documents" Without doubt the most arresting parts of the book are the chapters in which he deals with "Britain's War Finance and Economic Future" and "Britain's Coming Industrial Supremacy." Mr. Ellis Barker is the reverse of a pacifist, and he emphasises the beneficent result of war. "Nations," he says, "are born in war and die in peace" Peace creates sloth, neglect, intrigue, and dissension A keen sense of danger, on the other hand, is the most powerful unifying factor known to history, and he points out how the enmity of a foreign power has united nations, illustrating his assertion by the hostility of Hungary to Italy, France to Germany, England to America, etc. But while admitting that "wars though disastrous to individuals, often prove a blessing to nations," he argues, we think unjustly, that "most men are born idlers," that "they prefer ease and comfort to physical and mental exertion. Hence they dislike and oppose change and progress." Necessity, according to Mr Barker, is the mother of all that is good in economics, while peace produces idleness and indifference, with their attendant evils, including the decline of industrial progress The fund of information which Mr. Ellis Barker has at his command, coupled with the careful study of his subjects, makes his new work a book which every one should read.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Rhododendrons, by J. G. Millais (Longmans, Green & Co) A very notable work has been added to botanical literature by Mr. Millais's wonderful volume on Rhododendrons. Gardeners will read with special interest the chapter on cultivation. Mr. Millais points out the necessity of planting close together, so that the leaves of the plants shall thoroughly cover the roots, and shield them from the summer sun. They must "be planted in large beds where the soil has been well trenched and prepared." Mr. Millais gives an exhaustive list of plants and hybrids with their geographical histories. The finest Rhododendrons come from China and the Himalayas, and they take kindly to the soil and

climate of Ireland and the West Coast of England and Scotland ; but as the great success of Mr. Millais proves, they can be brought to great perfection in the more uncongenial environment of West Sussex. This superb book is illustrated with many photographs and seventeen coloured plates. A number of the photographs were taken in China by Mr. George Forrest, who also gives an account of the plants which he discovered on the Lichiang Range. Mr. Millais maintains that with proper cultivation it is possible to grow Rhododendrons to bloom every month of the year, and he gives many hints to bring this happy result about. All those interested in the culture of this beautiful plant, with its many varieties, should not fail to read this valuable book.

Georgian Poetry, 1916-17 (The Poetry Bookshop). The prefatory note to the third and latest volume of Georgian Poetry suggests the aim of the series to be the presentation of poems by the younger generation. Upon this assumption it is hard to understand the inclusion of the elegy at the end, for it is clear to what generation Mr. Baring belongs.

Taken on its merits the volume is interesting, both as an indication of rise and fall in the power of the "older inhabitants," and because it includes nine newcomers. Of these Mr. Freeman is the most striking. His "Pigeons" has strength and delicacy ; the same may be said of Mr. Sassoon's "Death-bed." In "David and Goliath" and "The Lady Visitor" Mr. Graves shows an excellent economy of words with moving effect ; his "Star-talk" is delightful ; his style has originality. The war-poems of both the latter poets are more convincing than Mr. Nichols' essay in Marinettiesque verse. Other pieces worthy of special notice are Mr. Turner's "Yucatan" ; Mr. Squire's "A House" and "Ah Koelue" by a writer hitherto unknown to us.

We do not need to compare this volume with its predecessors to see that Mr. Bottomley has declined from his high level ; and Mr. Gibson's "The Hare" is so vivid in our minds that his present work seems insipid. Mr. Monro has, on a lower level, advanced ; and Mr. de la Mare here proves that he retains the secret of a unique and haunting magic.

The Education of the South African Native, by Charles T. Loram (Longmans, Green & Co.) Dr. Loram's carefully thought-out work on the "Education of the South African Native" is a valuable addition to the literature of that difficult subject. At first he considers in brief the methods at present employed for the education and general well-being of the natives, both by the Government and by Missionary Societies. To these latter he gives a full meed of praise for their devoted work to a cause often involving danger from climate and disease. He compares the white child with a native of the same age, and points out that the white child's mental capacities are always in advance of the black child's, whose mental development is often arrested during the period of adolescence. He further proves that the brain-power of the black man is inferior to that of the white. He shows the enormous increase of the native population, and points out the effect of contact of the races, from which cause arises the greatest difficulties and evils, for the black man is more swift to imbibe the vices of the white man than to acquire his virtues. Hence, as contact is necessary and inevitable, the necessity to educate the native suitably becomes a matter of grave moment. For among the wise and

well-meaning pedagogues there have been many unwise ones, and their rash prohibitions have sometimes done more harm than good to the moral end they had in view. Dr Loram strongly advocates the reconstruction of the native educational system, and his work goes thoroughly and impartially into all the details of the matter

The Grand Lodge of England, by Albert F. Calvert, with 280 portraits and other illustrations (Herbert Jenkins, Ltd.). Freemasons will find Mr. Calvert's book "The Grand Lodge of England" extraordinarily interesting reading. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by 280 portraits besides other illustrations. The vast amount of research among the records of the earlier lodges, undertaken by the author, deserves much commendation. The book deals with the shadowy origin of the great order, whose founder, tradition has it, hailed from the Temple at Jerusalem, and goes on to relate how some two centuries ago the first Grand Lodge assumed a definite appearance in 1717; and Anthony Sayer was elected Grand Master, and the Lodge held its first meeting at the "Goose and Gridiron" in St Paul's Church Yard. Since those early days there have been many eminent Grand Masters, including the Duke of Sussex, 1813-43, King Edward VII., and the Duke of Connaught. During the last hundred years or so Freemasonry has been steadily increasing all over the globe, and the number of its lodges would be difficult to enumerate; but Mr. Calvert points out that a fine and lasting memorial, in the shape of three great Institutions, has been erected to the three fundamental principles of the Order, Brotherly Love, and Truth: and many are the interesting remarks he has to make about the lodges in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Even masons well up in the lore of their Craft, and who care to follow its various developments, may learn much from this illuminating work, for the book is well worth careful study, and has much matter in it for reflection and enjoyment. Mr. Calvert is to be heartily congratulated on producing so useful a work.

Highways and Byways in Wiltshire, by Edward Hutton, with illustrations by Nelly Erichsen (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.). "Highways and Byways in Wiltshire" is an important addition to the well-known series. Mr. Edward Hutton has thoroughly availed himself of the vast supply of material which Wiltshire supplies for a county chronicler. The volume is printed on thick paper and is exquisitely illustrated by Miss Nelly Erichsen. The author has evidently made a deep and conscientious study of his subject, and omits no points of interest, though he perhaps gives an undue amount of space, interesting though they are, to descriptions of ecclesiastical architecture. His chapters which deal with the ancient part of the county leave nothing to be desired, for his account of Stonehenge, Old Sarum and Roman Wiltshire display the knowledge of a specialist. Wiltshire is by no means behind the other counties of England in its domestic architecture, and counts among its historic dwellings—Longford, built by the architect who erected Holland House; Longleat, Savernake, surrounded by its own forest, and many other houses of note, such as Charlton and Borowood. Though by no means a manufacturing county, Trowbridge and Bradford-on-Avon still supply a certain amount of cloth; and the quarries at Corsham and other

places yield quantities of good stone. Among the names of note which adorn this county, the author points out among many others such men as Addison, Wren, Bolingbroke, etc. Owing to its rather large size the volume is not very handy for carrying about, but it is interesting, well-written, and full of information.

Two Summers in the Ice-wilds of Eastern Karakoram, by Fanny Bullock Workman and William Hunter Workman (Fisher Unwin, Ltd.). Mr and Mrs Bullock Workman have written an extremely interesting book describing their travels in the ice-bound country of Eastern Karakoram, a district which is so far little known, stretching out North-East of Kashmir, and containing some of the highest mountains and largest glaciers in the world. The book is provided with about 140 photographs and three maps, and an appendix by Mr Campbell Smith, which gives a list of rock specimens collected by members of the expedition. In 1911 they traversed the Himalayas by the Loji La pass and proceeding from thence, crossed the Indus to its northern bank. They passed the summer of that year in the valleys of Hushe and Kondus to explore the glaciers which lie above this grand but desolate region where "flood, frost, and weather have played havoc with everything in sight, and converted the face of nature into a scene of arid, unearthly, diabolic desolation." Here they obtained much useful information, and the following summer their expedition explored the mighty glacier of Siachen. This glacier being practically unapproachable from its lower end, they followed the course taken by Dr. Longstaff over the Bilaphond La, losing two of their party *en route*, but they were able, in spite of many difficulties, to survey thoroughly the glacier and take a great number of photographs. The surveying party spent nine months on the glacier, and Mr Grant Peterkin made a map of some 850 square miles. Besides the thorough exploration of the Siachen glacier, the expedition discovered several new passes and mountains, two of which were 21,000 ft high. Having done much excellent work, instead of retracing their steps by Bilaphond La, the party were able to return by one of the passes they had so recently discovered. The book is of extreme interest throughout, besides being a valuable addition to Geographical literature.

The Compleat Schoolmarm, by Helen Hamilton (Blackwell). This book is a history in free verse of the heroine's life at school all the way from the "tender age of five" to the dignity of a "Head." The unimportant appearance of the outside of this little work is very curious, but immediately on reading the Preliminary Disquisition one realises that the writer has something to say and knows how to say it in a candid, humorous way. The day's curriculum is carefully gone through; all is hurry and dash, each subject has its special purpose: then comes the hour for games; even though the girls are tired and would be glad to rest, it must not be forgotten that hockey teaches one so much, one learns not to "flinch in pain."

If it should make one callous too
About inflicting pain on other,
What matter that?

The prize-giving day is a tremendous event, and with great satisfaction the mistress says of her pupils—

They are as much alike
As peas in pod

All the minor dissipations—dances, Saturday outings, old pupils' matches, and finally, summer holidays—are treated in the same spirit, and one realises vividly the forced and unnatural atmosphere that these young people are trained in. This is a brilliant exposure of our educational method where “to teach the young to see, to think and feel,” is not its way.

The Gods in the Battle, by Paul Hyacinthe Loyson, translated from the French by Lady Frazer, with an Introduction by H. G. Wells (Hodder & Stoughton). The translator's preface gives a short biographical sketch of the author, and shows his extraordinary activities as lecturer and writer since the outbreak of the European War. All his energies are directed towards one end, “the punishment of monstrous crime, and the reparation of foul wrong,” and then, peace based on justice. Mr H. G. Wells writes a short introduction, and tells how M. Loyson is a staunch democratic socialist; but as he wisely remarks M. Loyson explains himself and his views very clearly in “these brilliant open letters.” The first half of the book is in the form of open letters addressed chiefly to pro-Germans and Pacifists, in which with power and deep feeling he emphasises the essentials of the present struggle. In the letters to neutrals, M. Loyson urges the righteousness of the Allies' cause, and in his letters to America points out to that people that by being neutral they show “approval and support of Germany's war-power, of all the horrors and all the crimes of her bellicose barbarism.” The last part of the book is given to Romain Rolland. The first of these letters deal with the announcement that appeared in the *Temps* of July 7, 1915, in which the name of Romain Rolland appeared on the list of a German League—the *New Fatherland*. These letters are pathetic in their appeal to his friend to give up the comradeship of Pan-Germans. He then passes to “Above the Battle,” and with all the power of his pen he urges and pleads that Romain Rolland should see things in their true light; and cease to offend France by refraining from listening to the plaudits which were bestowed on him by the enemy. The letters are extraordinarily powerful, and show in every sentence the author's deep and heartfelt feelings for the cause of right. The book has certainly not suffered by translation; the points could not have been more forcibly stated, nor stated in finer language in the original. The translator too must have been in cordial agreement with all its fine sentiments.

The Intelligence of Woman, by W. L. George (Herbert Jenkins, Ltd.) This book is a lucid and stimulating account of woman's place in the world, and Mr. George has regarded her position and the part she has played and ought to play from every possible aspect. In the preface the war is spoken of as merely a “terrible incident” in our lives, and all the wondrous changes that people think will come after are simply those changes that people think *ought* to come; “War stimulates or retards, it does no more.” Mr. George then finishes the preface by

saying, "Woman will not be remoulded by change because she is the spirit of change ; her progress may be hastened or retarded, but everything that happens to her will merely accentuate what was already in her." He then goes on to discuss "where woman will come in" in the future. In the first chapter, "The Intelligence of Woman," Mr. George defines intellect as "an aspiration toward material advantage, absolute truth or achievement," and gives several instances of typical intellectuals amongst men ; but when it comes to "seeing life sanely, and seeing it whole without much pity, without love," he cannot find a single instance of an intellectual woman ; but he thinks that woman's intellect has made rapid progress in the past half century, and has been steadily tending towards approximation with that of man ever since the Renaissance. The next chapter is headed "Feminist Intentions," and two points are discussed. (1) They intend to open every occupation to women. (2) They intend to level the wages of women and men. The first point is demanded because any limitation on woman's activity is considered degrading. The second point is discussed at great length, and Mr. George argues that when woman has increased her power she will be fitter for power, and when man realises that she is no longer his "rival and foe" she will fall into her natural rôle of "partner and mate." In the chapter on "Uniforms for Women" there is much sound common sense, and it would be well if the suggestions were universally adopted. Woman, Mr. George thinks, has not shown any rare capacities in painting, there has not been a single woman painter who could rank with the greatest men painters ; but in the realms of acting, dancing, in executive music and in literature woman has shown great talent. In the discussions on The Downfall of the Home, The Break-up of the Family, Some Notes on Marriage, he shows the great changes that have already taken place, and proves that given freedom woman will accomplish all she wants. The final chapter lays great stress on the necessity for women to organise themselves ; they must organise themselves into unions, and thus united they will have a powerful weapon and will be ready for all difficulties and hardships. Woman has a hard time ahead, but she will break down all obstacles and emerge from her difficulties "self-conscious" and "sex-conscious." The book is written in a philosophic spirit ; but the comments are extraordinarily acute and vivacious, and the book has the undoubted effect of stimulating one to think carefully on this important subject.

Irish Memories, by E. GE. Somerville and Martin Ross (Longmans, Green & Co.). There is something very sad about these Irish Memories, because the fact is vividly brought home to the reader that the partnership which gave to the world "Some Experiences of an Irish R M." is now broken, and the British public is never again to be cheered and brightened by stories from the perfect collaboration of these two great artists. Miss Somerville gives us a history of a deep and true friendship of two people whose tastes and upbringing were very similar. Martin Ross (Miss Violet Martin) and Edith Somerville were cousins, and the earlier chapters of these memories are devoted to records of their family, the most important of whom was the authors' common great-grandfather, Chief Justice Bushe. In one of his very charming letters to his wife

"The Chief" gives a vivid account of Maria Edgeworth and her family. Maria Edgeworth afterwards became a great friend and constant correspondent of the Bushes, but her letters are in no sense remarkable. In one of his letters "The Chief" says of her, "She is as well bred and as well dressed, and as easy and as much like other people, as if she were not a celebrated author" "No pretensions, not a bit of a blue-stocking is to be discovered," "her want of affectation is unaffected." Miss Somerville then gives other family letters, but the most delightful of all is the one written by a little girl not much older than seven years somewhere about 1830 It is so charming that it is worth quoting in its entirety ; she says.—

"My Dear Mama

"I am very sorry for touching that stinking little cat. I'll try to-morrow and Teusday if I can do as happy and as well without touching Dawney I had once before my birthday a little holiness in my heart and for two days I was trying to keep it in and I exceeded a little in it but alas one day Satan tempted me and one day I kept it out of my heart and then I did not care what I did and I ware very bold. One day. the week after that I tried without touching Dawney and I thought myself every bit as much happy but I was tempted tempted tempted another day ; but I hope to-morrow morning I may be good Mama and that there will be one day that I may please Mama.

"Your aftectionate daughter,
"Nannie Fox"

Then follow descriptions of the early life of the authors. Martin Ross as a child living in her beautiful home of Ross in County Galway, and the poor people with their "good manners" associating very closely with the family The unique experience of the Dublin Sunday School, and how her fellow-scholars adored her, and in spite of the fact that she took part in all the school feasts and revels, when that part of her childhood had passed "there wasn't a singe on her"—refinement was surpassingly hers. Miss Somerville studied Art in Paris, and her memories of those days are intensely interesting The two did not meet until they were grown up, and it was in October, 1887, that they began to write their first book, given various names by their family, but known to the public as "An Irish Cousin." Miss Somerville tells the interesting fact that their work was done conversationally, and after being "argued, approved, or modified, it would be written down by one or the other of them." Their first book was published in 1889. Delightful chapters devoted to life at Drishane follow, and on the restoration at Ross. Martin Ross and her mother went back to Ross after an absence of sixteen years. "The Real Charlotte" was begun at Ross in 1889 and was published in 1894. This was the most original and the cleverest of their books. In January, 1895, Martin went to Scotland on a visit, and it was here that she discovered that "The Real Charlotte" had made a mark. She met Andrew Lang who told her that "Charlotte treated of a new phase, that was its chiefest merit." In her letters to Miss Somerville she gives most vivid accounts of his courtliness and kind-

ness to her, and at the end of her visit she writes, "The dissipations have raged and I have been much courted by the ladies of St. Andrews I shall not come back here again Having created an impression, I shall retire on it before they begin to find me out It will be your turn next." "Some Experiences of an Irish R. M." was published in 1899, and perhaps it is the book most read by the general public. Miss Somerville tells the amusing story of the French sportsman who on asking for the name of a good sporting novel was advised to read "Some Experiences of an Irish R. M." "But I did not think such things existed in Ireland" —he imagined the title to be "Some Experiences of an Irish Harem." Miss Somerville has fulfilled her task with great skill, and the book is assuredly filled with the "people, things, and events that she (Martin Ross) loved and was interested in."

Rustic Sounds and Other Studies in Literature and Natural History, by Sir Francis Darwin (John Murray). Sir Francis Darwin has collected a number of his essays and lectures and has made them into a most readable book. In a delightful manner he discourses on the Rustic Sounds that he has loved since childhood, and his description with illustration, of the making of whistles from a branch of a horse chestnut is both simple and fascinating In the essay on "The Movements of Plants," with the simple experiment proving that the tip of the root is the sense organ for gravity ; and why, as in the narcissus, as the flower opens the stalk bends into a horizontal position, one realises that one is listening to one of the greatest living authorities on the subject From a description of a "Lane in the Cotswolds," on a spring day, Sir Francis passes on to a discussion of the books of Jane Austen, and he attempts to classify her characters as the flora of a given land is dealt with He classifies only a few of the young men who occur in the novels, but he says, "I leave the completion to those who can devote a life-time to the subject" In "The Education of a Man of Science," many valuable hints on education are to be gathered, and the final essay on "Dogs and Dog Lovers" reveals Sir Francis as being a most enthusiastic admirer of every kind of dog.

In Good Company, by Coulson Kernahan (John Lane). Mr Coulson Kernahan's book is a collection of studies, of the great men that he has known—Swinburne, Lord Roberts, Watts-Dunton, Oscar Wilde, Edward Whymper, and S. J. Stone, the hymn-writer. The paper "When Stephen Phillips Read," as the author says, only pretends to give one aspect of Stephen Phillips's personality, but the paper is written so sympathetically and musically that one is placed, so to speak, in the correct atmosphere and in the right attitude of mind to listen to a great poet read. The Swinburne recollections are unusually interesting, and also his confession as to his hatred of letter-writing ; he had once said to the author "that had he in early and middle-life refrained from writing letters there would have been twelve more volumes by him, and of his best, in the publishers' lists." The paper on Watts-Dunton is written at great length, and gives a very vivid picture of his personality and of his great genius for friendship. The chapter on Oscar Wilde gives one or two facts on that writer's views that were not known before Edward Whymper is shown to be a most interesting personality, but one feels

that one would rather meet him in a book than in real life. The chapter on the Rev. S. J. Stone, the hymn-writer, is full of the self-sacrificing deeds of a noble and high-minded man, and is written with a fervour of keen appreciation for the man and his work.

V. FICTION.

Sonia—Between Two Worlds, by Stephen McKenna (Methuen & Co., Ltd) The sub-title of this dramatic story means the England of pre-war days with its folly, "its butterfly Society of London," its disputes between Capital and Labour, and the England of the future whose sufferings help one to feel that "now we seem to have a chance of winning our souls back" Oakleigh tells the story, and it opens in the year 1898 where we are introduced to the boys' public school at Melton, where are Oakleigh, Loring, Dainton, Sinclair, and the rest The Head Master has just admitted David O'Rane who at the age of fifteen can speak Russian, French, Italian, and Spanish, having knocked about Europe, the States, and Japan, "on the underneath side" O'Rane has many escapades, and for helping in the May-Day Celebrations of the Melton carpet-makers he is on the point of being dismissed from school After Oakleigh and Loring leave Melton for Oxford, O'Rane, who remains a year or two longer, finally becomes captain of the school. During his Leave-out Days he sees a great deal of Sonia Dainton, and to her he would tell all his thoughts and dreams, and at this time, "the only two souls on earth who believed in the reality of his dreams were Sonia and—the dreamer." O'Rane went up to Oxtord during Loring and Oakleigh's last year It was during Commemoration Week that Sonia Dainton, although only sixteen, was allowed to come to Oxford to the festivities, and on one of the evenings she and O'Rane announced to George Oakleigh that they had become engaged to be married The engagement was treated with contempt by Lady Dainton—her husband had recently been created a baronet—and was broken off. Sonia was then taken into Society, became engaged for a short time to the snob Crabtree, and gradually became the worthless butterfly that the atmosphere she lived in required of her. "Her personal success went to her head, and it took ten years of three lives and a war at the end to sober her and restore some sense of perspective" O'Rane still believes in her In 1906 George Oakleigh enters Parliament as a Liberal; O'Rane goes abroad, and nothing is heard of him until 1910 when he suddenly turns up, but when he is told of Sonia's engagement to Loring he disappears again Oakleigh is rejected by his constituents in this year. The engagement between Lord Loring and Sonia is a short-lived affair, and poor Loring, who is much upset at Sonia's behaviour, hurries abroad and remains away until the spring of 1914 In this year O'Rane enters Parliament as a Conservative, and at this time Sonia is seeing life breathlessly, "private balls and public masquerades, Tango Teas and *Soupers Dansants*, with their horseplay and occasional tragedies fill her life." Loring returns to London and becomes engaged to Violet, and then suddenly amidst all the gaiety there is the rumour of war, and a few days afterwards the great European War has become a reality.

O'Rane at once joins the army as a private and goes to France. Sonia takes up war work, and is willing to "wash saucepans and clean grates." The first year of the war is over, numbers of those who went first are dead, and of all those friends only two are left—O'Rane and Oakleigh. O'Rane's tragic experiences have somewhat tempered his wild mind, but in spite of his affliction he finds life still worth having and still much for him to do in the world.

The story is told with great powers of description, and Mr. McKenna's sketches of party politics are brilliantly done. His pictures of London Society are drawn with great force, and he conveys to the reader a vivid impression of the mad rush of the social tide during the period just before the war. The characters in the book are well drawn, but the most convincing is the heroine Sonia Dainton. O'Rane is not altogether real, but his adventures help one to be keenly interested in him. Of the minor characters Lord Summertown and Baxter-Whittingham are the most convincing, while Burgess the "Head" of Melton, Loring the young Marquess, and Erckman the millionaire Jew are somewhat hackneyed types, and not altogether alive.

In the Wilderness, by Robert Hichens (Methuen & Co., Ltd.), is a moving and tragic story centred round the lives of three people, Dion Leith, his wife Rosamund, and Cynthia Clarke, showing the contrasting loves of two women of widely different characters. The story opens at the Hotel Cavour in Milan where travellers are just arriving. Amongst them are Rosamund Everard, a radiant and beautiful girl, with her sister Beatrice and their guardian, Bruce Evelin, a well-known Q.C., now retired from practice, and a solitary traveller, Dion Leith. The next scene is in London, Dion and Rosamund have become friends, and Dion has proposed to Rosamund, and they are married. They go to "the land of the early morning" for their honeymoon; she is as charmed with Greece as he, and they spend a superlatively happy holiday. On their return they settle in a small house in Westminster, and their child Robin is born there. The night before he is born Dion dines with Bruce Evelin and Beatrice. Guy Daventry is there and is most excited about a divorce case in which he is to be junior to Sir John Addington in the defence of Mrs. Beadon Clarke, the defendant, it will be a big case, in fact a *cause célèbre*. Later Dion meets Mrs. Clarke and is much interested in her; her "husky voice" and striking and unusual personality take a peculiar hold over him, and he decides at their first meeting that "that woman is surely innocent." The case came on, and Dion attended the court on two occasions and his sympathies were totally on Mrs. Clarke's side, he considered her very clever but not very wise. The case ended as everyone expected, Mrs. Clarke won, and Daventry and Beatrice married as the result of his success. Mrs. Clarke was again seen in Society, but Rosamund, who was much taken up with her child and who went out very little, did not meet her until long afterwards, although Cynthia Clarke was very keen on making the acquaintance of Rosamund. Mrs. Clarke decides to return to Constantinople, and Dion then realises how deep an impression she has made on him. Dion is still much devoted to Rosamund, but she often seemed to leave him out in her calculations and was almost too engrossed with her child. Suddenly the South

African War breaks out, and Dion Leith is amongst the first to volunteer for active service and sails for South Africa early in the New Year. Rosamund leaves London with Robin and decides to stay in the country until Dion's return. She loves the new life, and is absolutely engrossed by it, and seems to think very seldom of Dion, in fact Canon Wilton's remark that "Leith has a great heart, when will his wife understand its greatness?" seemed to be very just at this time. Dion returns from South Africa in splendid health without a wound; and he fancied in those first days that Rosamund was more sensitive to him than formerly, more anxious about his opinion on various matters, and he is most happy. After Dion had been home three days he went to London to keep a promise which he had made to Lord Brayfield while he was dying to give a "last message" from him to Mrs. Clarke in person. He found Mrs. Clarke most cordial and delighted to see him. Dion returns to Welsley the next day and decides to have a fortnight's real holiday with Rosamund and Robin. Robin adores his father, and they seem to understand each other better than ever before. Rosamund is anxious to make things in Welsley attractive for Dion, and so she arranges a day of shooting in which Robin shall go with his father alone and she will wait at home to welcome them back. That day, which had begun for them in the most radiant and joyful way, ended in most poignant tragedy and changed the lives of all. Some months pass and we find Dion in Pera living under another name, and so changed in appearance that his face had lost all the old charm and its expression now is a "frozen fierceness." He soon meets Cynthia Clarke who begins to weave her spell over him, and life for them is one orgy of pleasure and hypocrisy until Dion's soul sometimes sickens at it. He seldom thinks of Rosamund, the good woman who had ruined his life; and tries to feel that in Cynthia Clarke there was more warm humanity than in those good women who never step out of the beaten path of virtue. As time goes on Cynthia Clarke tires of Dion, as she has tired of all her victims; but Dion is saved from an ignominious dismissal by the appearance of Rosamund in Constantinople, who has come to him at last, and when she sees what her cruelty has made of him she is able only to say, "just forgive me—and let us begin again."

The story in its romantic setting makes a most vivid impression. The descriptions of Greece, Constantinople, Stamboul, and Pera are very powerful; and one lives in their different atmospheres without an effort. The character of Cynthia Clarke is wonderfully drawn, and one cannot but feel in spite of her immoral outlook and mode of life that she is much more interesting than the virtuous, self-centred, dull and very tiresome Rosamund. Dion's character is not very stable, but he is certainly more vital and arresting when he is living with Cynthia Clarke, who appeals to his intellect, than when he is with Rosamund, whose limited outlook on life seems to cramp his soul and his vitality.

The Shadow-Line, by Joseph Conrad (Dent & Sons, Ltd.) This is one of Joseph Conrad's most highly imaginative stories. The first part tells of how a mate, who had just "chucked his birth for no reason," got a captaincy. Captain Giles, the expert in intricate navigation, is the man

who discovered the steward's obscure intrigue to get the job for Hamilton and is able to inform the mate just in time for him to secure the ship. The story then goes on to describe the new captain's introduction to his ship, "she looked like a creature of high breed—an Arab steed in a string of cart-horses," and to his men. The first mate Burns shows that he thinks he has been ousted from his rightful position as commander, and proceeds to tell the new captain the details of the late commander's death. Ransome the cook, "with his well-bred face and the disciplined independence of his manner, made up an attractive personality," and was described by Burns as the best seaman in the ship, but owing to there being "something wrong with his heart, he musn't exert himself too much or he may drop dead suddenly." Before starting on the voyage the ship's crew suddenly began getting ill, at first it was the steward and then Mr. Burns gave up and went to bed with a raging fever; but in spite of these drawbacks the captain feels certain that once he can get out of the river into the sea all would be well with his men, and he starts on the voyage. All the episodes of that voyage—the persistent dead calm; the gradual spreading of the tropical fever to all the crew with the exception of Ransome and the captain; the overwhelming agony of the captain when he finds that four of the bottles, which he had imagined were filled with quinine, in reality were filled only with some useless powder; the first mate's obsession that the late captain was exercising some evil spell to destroy the ship and crew, and to get her past latitude 8° 20' North when all would go well, and the final exorcising of the "malicious spectre," by the awful laugh of Mr. Burns, and how the evil spell is broken and the curse removed and the ship is finally sailed back to port by the captain and the steward—are told with such power of suggestion, and the general atmosphere of "purposeful malevolence" is so acute that it fills the reader with an awful dread, and he can feel with the commander the same "creeping paralysis of a hopeless outlook." The character of Ransome with his diseased heart "who worked with us silent too, with a little smile frozen on his lips," is a heroic and lovable figure and drawn with a masterful hand. Captain Giles, too, is a fine personality and most wonderfully revealed. The book is a masterpiece, it is Romance of the highest order.

A Diversity of Creatures, by Rudyard Kipling (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.), is a volume of short stories, and deals entirely with modern people of very diverse character, and who talk and behave just as one would expect Mr. Kipling's characters to talk and behave. Some of the characters are well known, Stalky turns up again as an Army ragger in "The Honours of War," and again in "Regulus," as a schoolboy learning Latin. "My Son's Wife" gives a hunting young lady who can talk of nothing but hunting, but in an emergency can act with sense and vigour. The first story, "As Easy as A.B.C.," is a wild fantasy in which the Aerial Board of Control—a body of a few score persons—controls the Planet in A.D. 2065, and whose motto is Transportation is Civilisation, and whose fleet exists in order to keep the planet free of crowds and to prevent any invasion of privacy. "The Village that Voted the Earth was Flat" is written in the same vein, and so also is "The Horse Marines." "In the Presence" is written in Mr. Kipling's serious method, and gives a beautiful and vivid picture of the four Goorkhas who kept watch over the body

of the dead king. The last two stories, "Swept and Garnished," and "Mary Postgate," were written in 1915, and both have incidents of war as the theme of their tale. Mary Postgate is not the possessor of a fine mind, and her action—or want of action—is only such as could be carried through by one whose soul had always been starved. The stories are very ingenious and in many cases certainly diverting.

Beyond, by John Galsworthy (W. Heinemann). The story opens at the marriage of Gyp, Major Winton's daughter, with "the fiddler fellow" Gyp's mother—the wife of a country squire, fifteen years her senior—died at the child's birth, and the secret of the child's paternity was never told to the world. After her death Winton spent six years in India and Egypt, and losing his right hand in a charge against dervishes he retired from the army. On his return to England he saw the child for the first time, and the squire dying shortly afterwards, Winton found that he had been made Gyp's guardian and trustee. He installed her with Nurse Betty at his hunting-box at Mildenham and then he schemed to get her away from the squire's relations. In one year he had isolated her completely, and father and child lived a life of perfect happiness in an unconventional manner. It was on the night of her first ball that Gyp heard by accident that "Dad" was her real father, and was overjoyed at the knowledge. Some time afterwards Gyp went with her father to Wiesbaden, and there she met Fiorsen, the Swedish violinist, and her marriage to him took place later when she was twenty-three. The marriage, as her father feared, turned out to be a most unfortunate one; Fiorsen with his violent tempers, intemperate habits, and unfaithfulness could never be trusted, and Gyp gradually began to see that happiness with him was almost impossible. After her little girl was born Gyp tried harder than ever to be just to him, but after one unforgettable scene, in which he purposely tried to injure the child, she fled from him in the night with her baby and returned to her father's house. She had been at Mildenham all the winter and spring living very quietly, riding and pursuing her music as best she could, and seeing hardly anyone except her father. One day in April she was going up to town, and in the train she met Bryan Summerhay whom she had met in the hunting-field before her marriage. Their friendship ripened very quickly into love, and when Fiorsen once more forced himself on her she told him of her love for Summerhay, hoping thereby to rid herself of him for ever. Fiorsen was furious but took no steps to try to force her to alter her decision, except on the one occasion when he stole her child for one night. Daphne Wing and Fiorsen again met, and she effectually helped him to forget his Gyp and the confession which she had so openly made to him. Bryan and Gyp at last decide to make a home together, and Major Winton, without a word of remonstrance or complaint, was able to send his thoughts back to his youth, and with the words, "He has luck; I had none," Gyp leaves him to go to her lover. From that time life for Bryan and Gyp was wonderful, at last Gyp knew what it was to love, "her heart had grown," since that time when she had married Fiorsen, and in their country home with little Gyp the two, for three years, had had no cloud to darken their perfect happiness. And then the end came, but Gyp in time recovers and is able to say, "and

yet I wouldn't have been without it," and so takes up the threads of life again. The book is written with art and distinction, and many chapters have great power and beauty. The final tragedy, with its force and inevitability, is a moving and terrible thing. Gyp, the chief character, is very human and lovable, and magnanimous in all her dealings; while in Florsen, the musician, we get a very clever study of the irresponsibilities and meannesses of the spoilt artist, and he is often a very pitiable figure. Daphne Wing and her parents are very convincing, and Major Winton is true to his type.

Honeycomb, by Dorothy M. Richardson (Duckworth & Co., Ltd.). This most unique novel is the third in a series; and in it Miss Richardson continues the life of her heroine Miriam Henderson. In the opening Miriam has just entered on her career as governess in the country house of a rich English family. She rejoices in the warmth, fragrance, beauty, and ease which she has stepped into, and in her heart she thanks Mr. Corrie for this solitude "where all the worry and the noise and the fussing people" are shut away. Mrs. Corrie, with her "wavering chalky voice," is charming and sweet, but in spite of her beautiful surroundings and seeming gaiety Miriam sees that "her eyes and neck looked as though all the life and youth had been washed away from them by some long sorrow." Life at Newlands is different from anything that Miriam has yet felt, the unusual two-hour lessons each morning with those children "with their strange, untroubled brooding faces", the week-end visitors, Joey Banks "with her perfect smile"; but "who worries about her looks, just like any other girl"; the magnificent Mrs. Kronen, Mr. and Mrs. Staple-Craven. and in spite of their ease and jollity Miriam can see in all of them a general restlessness; they are all chasing after the happiness which they cannot seize. Even Mr. Corrie "with all his worldly happiness and success was miserable and lost and needing consolation"; "but he did not know it and perhaps would never know it." Miriam goes home for the two weddings, and we leave her in the end attending to her invalid mother in despair. Bob Greville tries to be very nice to her, but his chances seem very remote. "To keep free . . . and real. Impossible to be real unless you were quite free" is Miriam's summing up of life and people as she sees them. This most remarkable book is quite different in style from any other novel. Miss Richardson uses the impressionist method, and in a few words a whole scene is conveyed to the mind's eye; there is no recital of facts but just impressions of people's motives and imagined thoughts, and they are summed up into a vivid picture.

The Challenge to Sirius, by Sheila Kaye-Smith (Nisbet & Co., Ltd.). In her new novel Miss Kaye-Smith with great power shows "that the real stuff of life is experience, in which sorrow and fear and disaster have as important a part to play as beauty and joy." The story opens at Moon's Green, a small farm in the Isle of Oxney, a little place between Kent and Sussex, where John Rainger had gone to live with his small son Frank in order to get away from life. Frank Rainger lived a joyous and romantic life amongst his Redskins with Maggie Coalbran, the farmer's daughter, as chief playmate. Their greatest adventure was when they were about seventeen; they went to Cranbrook Circus and tasted every delight, and in spite of the "scolding and hiding" that

came at the end, Frank would suffer it all again if "I could have the rest over again too," he said, so intense had been the experience. As Frank grew older he found his romance in the fields round Moon's Green and in the daily business of the farm-yard ; he still went to the Parsonage for lessons, and he occasionally met Richard Leigh who finally persuaded him to leave the fields and go to London to earn his living at writing. Frank's father's death coming at this time he resolved to try, and went to London and became a journalist. The life oppressed him, the people seemed unnatural, but Rita Simons for one brief moment helped him to think that after all there was something to live for in London. After twenty months, and on the death of Luke Coalbran, Frank accepted the two brothers' invitation to come back to the farm, and he hoped that "in his honour as a yeoman farmer he would forget his disgrace as a journalist." Maggie Coalbran was married and lived happily with her husband at Mockbeggar, and the two found great delight in recalling memories of their childhood's days. Frank still loved Maggie, but her attitude towards him was purely friendly, but the years brought changes, and the old companionship became a dangerous thing, and so Frank, at Tom Coalbran's suggestion, went out to America with him to fight for the South. His experiences with the Confederates were exciting, and his meeting with Zollicoffer's three cousins a delightful change. Lorena Middleton tended to his wounds, and he found her most interesting. The bombardment of Vicksburg was terrible and its fall was imminent, Frank and Zollicoffer decided to "slip through the lines" and get back to the fight again. Lorena in disguise joined them and arrived safely at her mother's house at Maplehead, where Frank from Atlanta was a constant visitor and life in those weeks was paradaical. Things went badly for the Confederates, the men were getting dispirited and exhausted, and when suddenly the whole army was ordered to leave Atlanta, Rainger was unable to get a word to Lorena. To Frank's horror he hears that Maplehead is in the midst of the opposing armies, but they are obliged to march on. Zollicoffer is killed and Frank is wounded and cut off from his men, he goes in search of Lorena and finds her. The days that followed were passed in a dream, and his one thought was that he must make for the coast ; the Confederates had lost and his youth had gone, "but in spite of his broken body and empty heart there was still enough of him left alive to love the earth and the spring." Frank Rainger spent eleven years in Yucatan in that backwater in which he drifted after his tragic experiences, and now as a man of fifty he turned his face once more towards the old world, and with a resolve to forget those dead years with their "buried love and anguish," he settled once more amongst his beloved fields.

This is a beautiful story, told of people "with simple hearts and honest muscle." The hero Frank Rainger is a real child of nature, and all his actions are prompted by his fine feelings. Miss Kaye-Smith has given a very convincing piece of character-study in him. Maggie too in her humble, unaffected way is a person to be believed in. The descriptions are very powerful, the bombardment of Vicksburg is a vivid piece of writing. Miss Kaye-Smith is a great lover of Nature, and she has the power of making her readers enjoy the intimacies of a country life. The tale is a fine piece of literature.

SCIENCE OF THE YEAR.

I PHYSICAL SCIENCE

As forecasted last year the general trend of science during the past twelve months has been towards industrialism. The more prominent workers in pure science were, as before, wholly absorbed in war work and no advance of first-rate importance has been announced. On the other hand the services which pure science can render to the community have been realised more clearly than ever before. Its resources have been called upon for the public welfare, and the vast store of knowledge which has been accumulated in the last two decades has been ransacked for the solution of problems called into being by the war. This is proving beneficial in many ways. The manufacturer and the bureaucrat have been forced to see that scientific knowledge is an indispensable adjunct of continued national progress. In the case of the chemical industries the benefits to be derived from research carried on in laboratories of the college type were obvious to all who were not woefully ignorant or wilfully blind, but in physics the case was somewhat different. The later developments of this science are very remote from ordinary life. The training given to the student rarely touched on anything of industrial importance, so that, as a graduate, his choice of a livelihood was limited almost entirely to the teaching profession and his research was never directly aimed at the solution of problems of an industrial nature. Pure science was defending its existence with the work of Faraday and Maxwell, of Hertz and Marconi, and hoping for something else on a similar scale to turn up again. Undoubtedly it will, but meanwhile, and more especially in Great Britain, opportunities of lesser importance were being entirely neglected. Applied physics was almost non-existent because the needs of industry were unknown to the research worker. It must be recognised, however, that this state of affairs was largely due to the indifference of the manufacturer, and that in America and Germany the conditions were not nearly so bad. Happily in this country, too, this neglect is becoming a thing of the past, partly by individual effort, partly by the action of the learned societies—notably the Faraday Society—and partly by the new Research Department established by the Government as a result of the pressure which these societies have brought to bear upon it, a great change is taking place. In various ways science is being brought into touch with industry. Data hitherto hidden away in a form incomprehensible to the manufacturer are being recast into forms suitable for his use. Gaps in our knowledge are being brought to light and new lines of research, even in pure physics, are opening up.

The claim of science that it should form an essential part of any scheme of general education has so far been recognised that, in the proposed scheme for the Class I examination of the Civil Service, as set out by the Committee appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, general science is made a compulsory subject. Unfortunately, however, failure in the science paper does not involve disqualification, and since the maximum mark allotted to it is only 100 out of a total maximum of 1,900, it is hardly probable that the innovation will produce the revolutionary change in public school curricula which is so desirable for the future well-being of the country. The new scheme is weak too in other respects, and it has been severely criticised by the Committee on the Neglect of Science.

The Royal Society held its Annual Meeting on November 22 when Sir J. J. Thomson was again re-elected President, Sir A. B. Kempe, Treasurer, Professors A. Schuster and W. B. Hardy, Secretaries, and Professor W. A. Herdman, Foreign Secretary. The awards of medals by the President and Council for the year were as follows: Royal Medals to Dr John Aitken, F.R.S., for his researches on cloudy condensations, and to Dr. Arthur Smith Woodward, F.R.S., for his researches in vertebrate palæontology. The Copley Medal to M. Emile Roux, For Mem. R.S., for his services to bacteriology and for his pioneer work in serum therapy. The Davy Medal to M. Albin Haller, for his researches in the domain of organic chemistry. The Buchanan Medal to Sir Almroth Wright, F.R.S., for his contributions to preventive medicine. The Hughes Medal to Professor C. G. Barkla, F.R.S., for his researches in connexion with X-rays radiation.

The British Association had arranged to meet at Bournemouth in September as usual; but difficulties of travelling and other reasons caused the meeting to be abandoned altogether. The other activities of the Association, of course, continue in full swing. The report of the Committee on the Teaching of Science in Secondary Schools was issued in the late summer. The changes which have taken place since the last report was published in 1908 are considered in detail, and the present-day tendency to introduce science teaching for two hours only each week is strongly deprecated as being much too short for the training thereby obtained to have any practical value. An appendix contains tabulated data of the salaries of teachers in aided and maintained secondary schools. This makes most deplorable reading, and their utter inadequacy affords a very sufficient reason for the alleged shortage of school teachers. Considering the small salaries, the insecurity of tenure, the lack of promotion and lack of pension, the only wonder is that parents can be found foolish enough to allow their children to be trained for the profession. The Education Bill of 1917 promised some insignificant amelioration of these conditions, but, as recorded elsewhere, this Bill has been dropped, and the new Bill promised for 1918 is hardly likely to go further in this direction. The Board of Education has had a Departmental Committee sitting during the year to consider the principles which should govern the salaries of science teachers and the report is promised for the spring of 1918. In October the British Association made arrangements for meetings for the dis-

cussion of geophysical subjects, a branch of science at present much neglected in this country. Two such meetings have been held (one in November and one in December last), and three more at least are planned for 1918.

The eleventh annual report of the British Science Guild was adopted at the Annual General Meeting of the members of the Guild, held at the Mansion House on Monday, April 30, the Lord Mayor presiding. It was announced that, Sir William Mather having resigned, Lord Sydenham had accepted an invitation to become President of the Guild. The report contains a record of the work of the many committees which have been set up, including those of the Canadian and South Australian Branches of the Guild. It is further stated that "during the past year there have been many signs of awakened interest in the national significance of scientific work and method, the war having compelled attention to the consequences which would follow the further neglect of Science by the State."

The new State Department of Scientific and Industrial Research is unquestionably the most important factor upon which our future progress in scientific method depends. The Department was established in November, 1916, growing out of the Committee of the Privy Council for Industrial and Scientific Research which was itself set up in 1915 under the aegis of the Board of Education. It has at its disposal a Trust Fund of 1,000,000*l* to be expended on research during the next five or six years, and an annual grant from Parliament which, for the year 1916-17, amounted to 40,000*l*. The trust fund is being used for industrial research undertaken by specially formed Trades Research Associations registered under the Companies Act. Associations for the benefit of the following trades, among others, are in course of formation. Cotton Trade, Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, Photographic Manufacturers, Irish Flax Spinners and Weavers, and the Scottish Shale Oil Industry. The trades in question have themselves to contribute to the cost of the research, and it is hoped that, by the time the fund is exhausted, the Associations will have become self-supporting. The department has taken over the management of the National Physical Laboratory from the Royal Society and will finance it also from the trust fund.

The annual vote will cover (a) the cost of those researches which will not be undertaken by the proposed Research Associations; (b) grants to individual research workers, both students and others; and (c) the cost of administration. A considerable number of researches coming within the scope of (a) above have already been initiated or assisted financially by the department. Notable among these are (i) a research on Light Alloys for aeronautical work, which is being conducted at the National Physical Laboratory; (ii) on the Corrosion of Non-Ferrous Metals, at the Imperial College of Science and Technology, South Kensington; (iii) on Refractories for furnace linings and on Hard Porcelain, at Stoke; and (iv) on the Heat Treatment of High Speed Steel, at the Manchester School of Technology. In addition, experiments are being made for the purpose of removing certain difficulties experienced by English manufacturers of X-ray bulbs and

on the acoustics of the pianoforte. Perhaps, however, the most important work initiated so far by the department has been the establishment of a Director of Fuel Research with a Fuel Research Board to assist him in laying his plans. Sir George Beilby was selected for this post, and the Board has already published a report outlining the problems to be faced and their plans for the establishment, at Greenwich, of a Fuel Research station.

The Research Department is also contributing to the cost of the new Institute of Technical Optics which was opened during the year in the buildings of the Imperial College of Science. Very considerable progress in the development of this subject has been made. At the commencement of the war almost the whole industry was in German hands, and the problem of the supply of optical instruments (and of glassware generally) was the cause of grave anxiety to the British Government. First of all raw material was necessary. There is plenty of sand available, and a survey of the various deposits carried out during the last three years by Professor P. G. H. Boswell, of Liverpool University, at the instance of the Glassware Supply Department of the Ministry of Munitions, showed that, among them, were several suitable for the production of the finest optical glass. Next, methods of manufacture had to be considered; such details as the melting-pots, the furnace, and the protection of the molten glass from furnace gases all required working out. This part of the work was commenced at the National Physical Laboratory in 1915. Meanwhile Professor Jackson of King's College, London, undertook to investigate the composition of certain optical glasses, and with the assistance of the Glass Research Committee of the Institute of Chemistry, succeeded in defining the composition of the batch mixtures necessary for the production of several glasses hitherto manufactured exclusively at Jena in Germany, including the famous fluor-crown glass. Professor Jackson also succeeded in producing three new glasses with properties previously desired but unobtainable. His services to the nation in this and other respects were rewarded by a knighthood, his name appearing in the first list of Knights Commanders of the Order of the British Empire.

These fundamental steps having been taken, the more pressing of war-time necessities could, at any rate in part, be met; but in order that the industry should hold its own in the trying period which must follow the declaration of peace, it was recognised that it must be supplied with men thoroughly trained in the principles underlying the proper construction of optical instruments. It is to supply this urgent need that the Institute of Technical Optics has been created. The fundamental discoveries and calculations in geometrical optics were almost all made in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and only of late years has the far-sighted encouragement of scientific commercialism by the German Government given that country its pre-eminence in this branch of trade. There was not before the war even a single text-book on the theory of modern optical instruments in the English language, and the translation of suitable works has formed one of the first and most urgent duties of the new department! This thorough reorganisation of the optical industry has shown what can

be achieved when science is encouraged by Government aid. The strong pre-war position of the German trade was due to a steady flow of Government contracts over and above the fluctuating demands of the ordinary market whereby it became possible for the manufacturer to make and keep a widely varied stock of optical glasses. The new British industry, too, will require this help if German competition is to be met, and it remains to hope that, after the rough awakening the nation has received, the necessary assistance will be forthcoming.

Another research with which considerable progress has been made during the year is that into the so-called Nitrogen Problem. A large supply of nitrogenous material is required at all times. In peace it forms an essential constituent of agricultural fertilisers; in war it is equally essential for the manufacture of high explosives. For many years this supply has been drawn mainly from the Chile deposits, but this source is not inexhaustible, and twenty years ago Sir William Crookes drew attention to the fact that, when it gave out, the world's wheat harvest would fail unless steps were taken to manufacture nitrates on a large scale. His own researches, together with the experimental work of Lord Rayleigh, upon the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen (*i.e.*, its conversion from the free elemental state into nitrogenous compounds) by means of the electric arc, showed how an unlimited supply could be manufactured when natural resources failed. Many factories for nitrogen fixation on a large scale have since been set up in every country save that which gave birth to the idea. In Norway, Sweden, and the United States of America cheap water power is available and the arc process can be used; but in the absence of cheap power this mode of manufacture is too expensive and other processes have been worked out. The cheapest, so far, is that devised by Professor Haber, a well-known physical chemist of Karlsruhe, in which hydrogen and nitrogen are directly combined to form ammonia at a high temperature and pressure, and in the presence of a catalytic agent. The technique of this process is extraordinarily difficult, but the equivalent of 20,000 tons of ammonium sulphate was produced by it in 1913, and (according to a United States Government report) no less than 500,000 tons in 1917. The British Government, with its usual shortsightedness, was content to rely on the Chile deposits (that is, supposing it considered the matter at all); but in February, 1916, the importunity of the Faraday Society, together with the menace of the submarine campaign, caused the Ministry of Munitions to bestir itself in the matter, and an experimental investigation of the Haber method was commenced in the new chemical laboratories at University College, London. Many obstacles have had to be overcome in the course of the research, and when the Report of the Nitrogen Products Committee was issued in November, 1917, the final problems presented by the chemical engineering difficulties involved in the working of a full-sized trial unit had not been completely worked out. The erection of such a unit has, however, received official sanction, and the delay is not likely to be prolonged. The Committee has also investigated other processes of a more entirely chemical nature, and manufacturing plants on a commercial scale are in course of completion.

Outside the Government the most important of the numerous scientific committees inaugurated since the commencement of the war is that known as the Conjoint Board of Scientific Societies. This Board was the outcome of a meeting of the representatives of the leading scientific societies held on March 22, 1916, at the instance of the Royal Society. It was then decided that the Board should be formed and that its main objects should be (i) to promote the co-operation of those interested in pure or applied science, (ii) to supply means whereby the scientific opinion of the country might on matters relating to science, industry and education, find effective expression, (iii) to take such action as might be necessary to promote the application of science to industry and to the service of the nation. The Board meets in the rooms of the Royal Society and is financed by contributions from the constituent societies represented on it.

Ten Sub-Committees have been appointed to deal with questions of present importance and most of these have submitted, at the least, an interim report. The Sub-Committee on Agriculture is, among other things, considering the development of electrical applications to agriculture in this country. Electricity is used very largely in Germany, not only for stationary motor purposes, but also for ploughing, cultivating and hoeing. There is also the possibility of using it for intensive cultivation by discharging "high pressure" electricity over the cultivated area. The Watching Sub-Committee on Education reports that, in its opinion, school curricula up to the age of sixteen should be general and not specialised, including both literary and scientific subjects; while beyond this age specialisation should be gradual and not complete. The Metric System Sub-Committee has not yet sent in a report.

During the past year the Decimal Association has been carrying on active propaganda in favour of the decimalisation of weights, measures, and coinage, holding that, with the vast disturbance of values produced by the war, the present time is most opportune for the change. The whole position was reviewed last March by Mr H. Allcock, a member of the Executive Council of the Association, in a lecture delivered at the Institution of Civil Engineers. In particular it was shown how easily the change from the yard to the metre could be effected in the engineering trades. Mr. A. F. Barker, Professor of Textile Industries at Leeds University, discussed the advantages and disadvantages which would result to these industries if the metric system were introduced, in a report to the British Science Guild, and concluded that there is no serious difficulty to be encountered. Finally the Decimal Association has published a pamphlet giving details of the coinage system agreed to at a joint meeting with the Institute of Bankers and the Association of Chambers of Commerce. The pound sterling is taken as the monetary unit, and all the present coins down to the sixpenny piece would remain unaltered (except that the half-crown would disappear). Below the value of sixpence the scheme involves a complete change. The smallest coin would be the mil, the thousandth part of a sovereign, and equal therefore to .24 of the present penny. Bronze coins of 1, 2, 3, and 4 mils would be circulated together with 5 and 10 mil nickel pieces. The scheme was approved by the

Council of the Association of Chambers of Commerce on November 7, and it was decided to press the need for the reform through the Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the country. In view of the fact that the 5 mil nickel piece (equal to 12 pence) would almost certainly replace the penny instead of the 4 mil bronze coin (equal to '96 penny), and thereby, for most people, divide the shilling into ten parts instead of twelve, the chief opposition to the scheme will probably arise from the general public rather than from commerce.

Mention has already been made of the influence of the Faraday Society in connexion with the nitrogen problem. This society, which is rapidly forging to the front, was formed fifteen years ago for the discussion of problems of a physical or physico-chemical character. It has always been distinguished for its interest in technology. Its proceedings are notable for the discussions of subjects of current importance which are held at frequent intervals. These debates—for such indeed they really are—attract widespread interest and contributions are obtained from experts all over the world. Three such meetings were arranged this year. The first took place on March 6 when there was a general discussion on the Training and Work of the Chemical Engineer. The second was held on May 1, and dealt with Osmotic Pressure. Sir Oliver Lodge occupied the chair, and Professor A. W. Porter of University College, London, opened the debate. The subject has been the cause of keen controversy in the past, but now the kinetic theory, originally proposed by van't Hoff, has been put on a firm basis and seems likely, in the future, to meet with universal acceptance.

The third discussion took place on November 7, and dealt with Pyrometry (*i.e.*, the measurement of high temperatures), Sir R. T. Glazebrook presiding. During the last few years, and especially since the commencement of the war, the advantages of knowing the exact temperatures at which various operations in manufacturing processes take place have become widely appreciated and an enormous number of pyrometers of various kinds are now in use. One of the latest applications of these instruments is to the determination of the temperature at which steel is poured (*e.g.*, from a Bessemer converter). A paper on the Thermal Properties of Sulphuric Acid, read by Professor A. W. Porter at the December meeting of the Society, also demands notice here. War needs have caused a great deal of plant for the manufacture and use of this substance to be erected, and the designers have been considerably handicapped by the absence of any exact knowledge of its thermal properties at temperatures above 100° C., the scanty experimental data hitherto available applying only to its properties at ordinary temperatures. By the application of the theoretical principles of thermodynamics it has been possible to deduce from them further data applying to high temperatures and of sufficient accuracy for industrial needs. The author of the paper arranged his results throughout in the form required by the plant designer, and it is to be hoped that this paper will be the forerunner of many others on similar lines.

In pure physics the problems of radiant energy and of the structure of the nucleus of the atom are still the most important, and the most fascinating, of those confronting the research worker to-day. On the

first no appreciable progress has been made during the year. (Though an admirable statement of the present position will be found in "The Electron" by R. A. Millikan, University of Chicago Press—a semi-popular treatise.) We are still faced by the difficulty that to explain the phenomena of the interference and diffraction of light some form of wave theory is requisite; while the explanation of the phenomena of photoelectricity seems to require a quantum or "bundle" theory. As for the structure of the atom, the Rutherford theory of electronic "planets" revolving round a positively charged nuclear "sun" still holds the field. The structure of this nucleus is still a matter for conjecture, but rumour states that some remarkable discoveries have been made during the year, since, however, no statement has yet been made public this matter must stand over for the present.

II. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE.

It would be difficult to find a task harder than recording the advances of Biological Sciences during the year that has just passed, for, unlike the Physical Sciences, they have not the same direct bearing upon the immediate problems facing the world. The very word advance at once suggests to the mind a more or less spectacular step beyond the old boundaries of our knowledge, the opening up of new methods of work, new points of view, fresh explanations of known phenomena, or at any rate the production of a mass of data and detail that smooths the paths along which we travel or bridges some of the awkward places over which we had to jump in the past. Problems remain unsolved, gaps await filling, new lines of attack have to be opened out; the harvest indeed is plentiful but the labourers are few. In all countries Biologists are taking their part in the great conflict, many actually in the fighting services, and of these some, of whom we expected much, have unfortunately laid down their lives. Those not actually combatants are engaged in auxiliary work, and their results resemble small tactical successes rather than sweeping strategic moves, new methods of recognising bacteria, safer and swifter ways of detecting parasitic diseases and fresh means of coping with them, better technique in the drying or preserving articles of food, the keeping down of pests, and in general the utmost utilisation of natural resources both animal and vegetable.

Many of the publications to hand during the past year reflect this tendency and have a decided economic leaning, and some are frankly so. Of these some are on minor points, but some of considerable importance, as, for example, "The Insects Attacking Stored Wheat in the Punjab" ("Dept of Agriculture in India," vol. iv., No 6, 1916), by Barnes & Grove. Although published from a chemical department this is a Biological inquiry, for not only does it describe the parasites but also the means of dealing with them and so should be of use at the present time.

Several noteworthy Botanical text-books have been produced. West's book on the *Algae* ("Algae," vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, 1916) certainly supplies a much-felt need. It deals, as its sub-title states, with the *Myxophyceæ*, *Peridineæ*, *Bacillarieæ*, *Chlorophyceæ*, together

with a brief Summary of the Occurrence and Distribution of Fresh-water Algae. The advances of our knowledge in recent years has made such a publication necessary, and the useful bibliographies at the end of each chapter aid in reference to modern literature. Abnormalities of plants have been monographed by Worsdell in two volumes ("Principles of Plant Teratology," vols. i and ii. London, Ray Society, 1915-16). The subject has not been generally treated for many years, during which, of course, much has been recorded and our ideas of plant morphology undergone considerable modification. A plentiful supply of photographs and text-figures and a copious index render the books very valuable. Though small in size Jorgensen and Stiles' brochure reviewing the work that has been done on the green pigments of leaves and their chemical activities ("Carbon Assimilation" London, William Wesley & Son, 1917) will be found useful and stimulating. The processes dealt with are of basic importance in Biology, for without them plants and animals could not exist, and furthermore they underlie all forms of crop production. In addition to summarising the results of past work it indicates lines of research that may be profitably pursued. The third part of the text-book of Paleobotany for students of Botany and Geology that is being written by Seward has been published ("Fossil Plants," vol. iii. Cambridge University Press, 1917) Interesting and useful as the preceding volumes have been the present volume probably exceeds them in both points and is a remarkable work. It deals with the Pteridospermeæ, Cycadofilices, Cordaitales, and Cycadophyta. The author fittingly dedicates to the late Professor Zeiller of Paris, to whom this branch of Science owes so much, this most useful book. A book by Guppy on seed dispersal is always to be looked forward to as interesting reading, and the naturalist will certainly not be disappointed in the present volume ("Plants, Seeds, and Currents in the West Indies and Azores." London, Williams & Norgate, 1917) A mass of detail is set out regarding the current systems of the North and South Atlantic Ocean and the possibility of their conveying seeds across from West to East. Bottle drift is utilised as a means of estimating the speed at which objects can be brought across. There is also an interesting account of the flora common to the two sides, for example, the West Indies, and the West Coast of Africa, and of the possibility of the seeds surviving the prolonged immersion in sea water in this case during their transportation by the main Equatorial Current.

Various works deal with ecological problems. Boerker has investigated twenty-seven species in his "Ecological Investigations upon the Germination and Early Growth of Forest Trees" (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1916). The retention of soil moisture incident upon shade appears to be of considerable survival value. It leads to a prolongation of the germination period and an increase in the percentage of the seeds germinating. Drier soils have the reverse effect. The enormous importance of light is also shown by Salisbury (*Jour. of Ecol.*, vol. iv., 1917), who has studied the oakwoods with a hornbeam undergrowth such as are to be found in Hertfordshire. Two phases of illumination are met with, one from the fall of the leaf to the bursting of the bud in which the light intensity in the wood is getting on for half that

outside, and the other when the trees are in full leaf and the intensity drops as low as 1 per cent. of that outside. This light factor plays a marked part in the production of undergrowth. The method of invasion of the various plant associations of heath and woodland and the part taken therein by moisture and rabbits is recorded by Farrow in a series of papers "On the Ecology of the Vegetation of Breckland," the third part of which is now out (*Jour. of Ecol.*, March, 1917). Another long and inclusive paper on the ecology of terrestrial algae, although published by Petersen (*Mém. de l'Acad. Roy. des Sciences et des Lettres de Danemark*) in 1915, was apparently only available in this country during the period under review. Diatoms appear to be very widely distributed on dry earth, but are seemingly dependent on a low acidity of the soil.

In general one of the most outstanding features separating Monocotyledons from Dicotyledons is the absence in the former of the intrafascicular cambium so constant in the latter. Arber (*Annals of Bot.*, Jan., 1917) records the occurrence of such intrafascicular cambium in new genera of Monocotyledons and summarises previous results. This phenomenon is generally interpreted as indicating the derivation of the two groups from a common ancestral stock. Worsdell has put forward an interpretation of the morphology of the grass embryo based in the main on an investigation of abnormal maize seedlings. These possessed a bifurcation of the apex of the coleoptile, and it is suggested that the scutellum represents the lamina of the cotyledon and the coleoptile its ligule. Not much is known of the gametophytes of *Lycopodium*, so that the description of those of *L. laterale*, *L. scorosum*, and *L. volubile*, recently given by Chamberlain, help to fill up a rather marked gap.

Two papers on genetics call for notice. Bateson (*Jour. of Genetics*, Dec., 1916) has found that root shoots from the double white *Bouvardia*, "Bridesmaid," produce pink flowers of the variety known as "Hogarth." He interprets this by assuming that Bridesmaid is a periclinal chimæra with epidermis and hypodermis of the white variety. This implies a segregation of characters in the vegetative cells of the plant. Saunders describes the inheritance of doubleness in the flowers of *Mecanopsis*, *Althea*, and *Dianthus* (*ibid.*, 1917). Doubles and singles breed true, and in the F_2 generation there is a segregation into the usual simple Mendelian ratio.

Among the physiological papers are the following. It has been shown by Osterhout (*Bot. Gaz.*, June, 1917) that potassium cyanide, like ether, chloroform, and alcohol leads to a temporary reduction in permeability, perhaps as a result of its inhibiting oxidation. The amount of manganese in various land and water snails has been worked out by Boycott, and incidentally in the various plants used as food by the snails (*The Naturalist*, Jan. and Feb., 1917). There is much variation in the manganese content of plants; from as low as 6 parts per 10,000 in dried grass it ranges up to 690 parts in an aquatic moss. A very marked effect was produced on the rate of growth of *Lemna minor* by the addition of an aqueous solution of the extract of "Bacterised Peat," leading, as Bottomley has shown (*Proc. Roy. Soc.*, B, 1917), to an increase in rate of twenty times and in weight of sixty-two times that of the control. The same extracts were employed by Mockeridge (*ibid.*,

1917) on nitrifying and denitrifying bacteria. The activities of the former are accelerated, but those of the latter inhibited. Atkins has written a most useful résumé of our knowledge of "Osmotic Pressure in Animals and Plants" (*Science Progress*, April, 1917). The nature of osmotic pressure is not considered, but only its mode of action in the two kingdoms which differs very considerably, mainly owing to amount of sugar in plants.

Perhaps one of the most significant tendencies to be seen in the year's zoological results in this country is the attempt to establish new lines of work. In the United States, Zoology has branched out in all sorts of directions, Cytology, Experimental Morphology, and Embryology, Genetics, Heredity, Bionomics, and Biological theories to the last of which one journal (*American Naturalist*) is almost exclusively devoted. On the other hand, in this country, with the exception of Genetics and Biometry, the work has been mainly along the lines of purely descriptive Morphology and Embryology or of Systematics. The effort to get off these old lines, which may perhaps be termed the Balfourian tradition, is worthy of encouragement and will almost certainly lead to a renewed and wider interest in the Science.

Certain books indicate this attempt quite clearly. Russell ("Form and Function." London, John Murray, 1916) treats of the history of Morphology as illustrating the old dilemma of whether form precedes function or *vice versa*, and throughout the volume lays the stress on the functional side. No fresh matter is introduced, but a well-written historical criticism such as this is, proves not only interesting but very instructive. It furnishes a plea for the wider interpretation of the facts revealed by morphological research. Thompson also ("On Growth and Form." Cambridge, University Press, 1917) takes as his material the structure of living beings, in the main animals but certain aspects of plant anatomy as well. He shows in a striking way how the peculiarities of gross morphology or anatomical detail are related to and in many cases obviously controlled by the action of ordinary physical laws. Additional interest is lent to the book by its wide appeal on the one hand to the applied mathematician and physicist and on the other to the zoologist to both of whom it opens possibilities of further research along lines other than purely anatomical. A small volume ("Three Lectures on Experimental Embryology." Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1917) by Jenkinson, who was unfortunately killed in Gallipoli and was perhaps the only worker on the subject in this country, shows clearly the appeal of Embryology from its experimental side.

Another field of research, which although trodden in America has been neglected in this country save perhaps by Doncaster who has approached it, has been adopted by Gatenby in a series of illuminating papers on "The Cytoplasmic Inclusions of the Germ-Cells" (Part I., and an allied paper, *Quart. Jour. Micro. Sci.*, Aug., 1917; Part II., *ibid.*, Dec., 1917). The importance of the germ-cell in all problems of development or heredity is of course obvious, and much has been done on the nucleus of these cells. It is only comparatively recently, however, that other inclusions outside the nucleus have been investigated, and in the present papers they are dealt with in butterflies, moths, and snails.

Along Bionomic lines we have a study of "The Insect Association of a Local Environment Complex in the District of Holmes Chapel, Cheshire" (*Trans Roy. Soc. Edin.*, April, 1917), by Cameron. This is the first time an intensive study of the interrelations of insects, plants, and soil has been carried out in England, and as the author has now left for Canada it is to be hoped other workers will take this subject up. Somewhat allied to this but more utilitarian are Ritchie's paper on "The Structure, Bionomics, and Forest Importance of *Myelophilus minor*, Hart" (*ibid.*, Dec., 1917) and Rennie's note "On the Biology and Economic Significance of *Tipula paludosa*" (*Ann App. Biol.*, Jan., 1917). The subject of the latter is the "leather jacket," a crop pest with which many of us have become acquainted of late, and whose life-history is here described as a preliminary to work on its extermination or at any rate a reduction in its numbers. The former, although not so widely known, is nevertheless a pest that plays considerable havoc in the forest. These then represent the new lines of work.

A series of experimental studies on the correlation of movements in a sea anemone, *Metridium marginata*, have been carried out by G. H. Parker (*Jour. Exp. Zool.*, Jan., 1917) and their results examined in a comparative survey of "Actinian Behaviour" (*ibid.*, Feb., 1917). It is shown that the unity of action in such lowly organised forms is very weak owing to a fair amount of independence of the constituent parts. Bacteria, as is well known, form an integral part of the food of many small animals living in the water, and attempts have been made to estimate more exactly the part they actually take in feeding. The life-history of *Parameocum* and its depression periods have long been studied in America, but it is only recently that the effect of a strict food control by means of pure cultures of bacteria has been investigated by Hargitt and Fray (*ibid.*, Feb., 1917). Atkin and Bacot (*Parasit.*, July, 1917) have studied "The Relation between the Hatching of the Eggs and the Development of the Larva of *Stegomyia fasciata* (*Aedes calopus*) and the Presence of Bacteria and Yeasts." Moulds are not useful and may be detrimental, but bacteria and yeast are of the utmost importance, and the results obtained should prove of use both in the keeping down of this mosquito and in the rearing of it for experimental purposes.

Further attempts have been made to ascertain the structure and content of the germ-cell by experimental methods. "A Cytological Study of Artificial Parthenogenesis in *Cumingia*" (*Jour. Exp. Zool.*, Jan., 1917) was made by Morris, who found that by exposing the eggs to certain temperatures and the action of chemically treated sea-water a kind of development could be initiated which, although not leading to normal larvae, yielded results which indicate the importance of nuclear fusion in starting segmentation. By the use of a centrifuge Conklin (*ibid.*, Feb., 1917) shows that the egg of *Crepidula*, the slipper limpet, can be separated into three zones, a yolk zone, an oil zone, and an intermediate layer containing nucleus centrosome and cytoplasm. The principal factor in the differentiation of the daughter cells appears to be the structure of the cytoplasm apart from its inclusions. Pearl too has a series of papers on "The Experimental Modification of the Germ-Cells" (Parts I and II., *ibid.*, Jan., and Part III., Feb., 1917) with a general

discussion of "The Selection Problem" (*Amer. Nat.*, Jan., 1917) In the latter Darwin's theory is discussed, and the author refers with justifiable pride to the light thrown upon it by "that branch of biological science in which America has taken a leading place." The author insists that for a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena of heredity and selection it is necessary to attack the germ-cell and not the animal when fully grown.

A certain amount of work of the kind with which we are more familiar in this country has also been carried out both here and in America, but although much of it is good none appears to be of outstanding importance One thing has happened which, although not research, should lead to its encouragement, and that is, that at the beginning of the year the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* changed hands and has now become the property of the Anatomical Society. The physiological papers dropped off some years ago when the *Journal of Physiology* appeared, and had practically ceased, so that with the appearance of the present volume (11.) the title was changed to the *Journal of Anatomy*. It is now issued under an editorial board which is composed of some of our leading Anatomists and Embryologists. This is a very welcome change, for previously it was not so important a publication as, for example, the *American Journal of Anatomy*, and already in its first year it gives promise of a successful future, for it includes some very good papers It is to be hoped that this venture will meet with the full support of Anatomists and Morphologists.

The Pituitary body has long been the subject of research by comparative anatomists, but although a good deal was known about it among higher mammals and lower vertebrates, practically nothing was done on the lower classes of mammals. This gap has been filled in by a paper by Parker on "The Development of the Hypophysis Cerebri, Pre-oral Gut, and Related Structures in the Marsupialia" (*Jour. Anat.*, April, 1917). Careful investigation of a series of embryos of representative Marsupial types has thrown considerable light on the origin and adult structure of this somewhat complex structure, and also its relation to the surrounding tissues in the embryo. Also dealing with the Marsupials and Monotremes are a couple of papers by Mackenzie (*ibid.*, Oct., 1916, April, 1917) who describes the peritoneum and intestinal tract A detailed study of the primordial cranium of the water-rat, *Microtus amphibius*, is contributed by Fawcett (*ibid.*, July, 1917) The study is based on a series of sections and also on a model built up by the wax-plate method, and adds to our knowledge of the primitive mammalian cranium which we owe in the main to Voit.

An interesting new species and genus of Heliozoon and the method of its division have been described by Dobell (*Quart. Jour. Micro. Sci.*). According to Stephenson (*ibid.*, Aug., 1917) the so-called, pharyngeal gland-cells of earthworms should not be so described, but are better termed "chromophil-cells" since they are certainly not glandular in function.

The Arthropods have as usual provided a plentiful field for research, among which may be mentioned one or two papers. Calman (*ibid.*, Dec., 1917) treats of an important species that has recently been redis-

covered in "Notes on the Morphology of *Bathynella* and some Allied Crustacea." A series of papers entitled "Experiments and Observations on Crustacea" (Parts I, II, III., IV., V., *Proc. Roy. Soc., Edin.*) have been published by Tait, in which the author attempts to show the relation between the structure and function of certain parts of the crustacean anatomy. The relations between the carnivorous larvæ of certain Diptera has been dealt with at great length by Keibin in "Recherches sur les Anthomyides à Larves carnivores" (*Parasit.*, May, 1917) and intermediate forms described, which possibly indicate the lines along which the purely carnivorous species have been developed. These latter species are indirectly of economic importance since they destroy the larvæ of other Diptera, including house-flies. Another small group of Diptera, the Nycteribidæ, are exclusively parasitic on bats, and their life-history and structure, which, as might be expected, is much modified, are dealt with by Scott (*ibid.*, July, 1917).

The vertebrates, too, claim a fair share of attention. A very stimulating discussion of the "'Proboscis pores' in Craniate Vertebrates, a Suggestion concerning the Premandibular Somites and Hypophysis" is furnished by Goodrich (*Quart. Jour. Micro. Sci.*, Dec., 1917). These pores, all of the nature of coelomostomes, throw considerable light upon the vexed question of the constitution of the craniate head. Further work on the anterior end of the craniate is to be found in "The Homologies of the Muscles related to the Visceral Arches of the Gnathostome Fishes," by Allis (*ibid.*, Aug., 1917), in which the modifications of these muscles in the various groups of fish are described. Watson has suggested "A Sketch-classification of the Pre-Jurassic Tetrapod Vertebrates" (*Proc. Zool. Soc.*, July, 1917) based on a consideration of all parts of these ancient Amphibia and Reptilia. A subject naturally of considerable interest is "The Chromosomes of Human Spermatocytes," which have been investigated by Wieman (*Amer. Jour. Anat.*, 1917).

One of the most important publications of the year is that of Carter on "The Cytomorphosis of the Marsupial Enamel-organ and its Significance in Relation to the Structure of the Completed Enamel" (*Phil. Trans.*, B, Dec., 1917). Not merely does the enamel of the marsupial tooth differ from that of most other mammals, but its structure has not been previously determined successfully. Another point in the present paper is that almost for the first time we have the structure of teeth investigated by satisfactory histological methods, a great advance on most odontological work, where fixation, etc., has usually been crude, and a line of research that should lead to a marked advance in our knowledge of this subject.

Certain books published during the year also call for brief mention. Darbshire, also a victim of the war, has put forward his views on modern biological theories ("An Introduction to Biology and Other Papers." London, Cassell & Co., 1917). Unfortunately, he did not live to finish the book and the finished chapters are entirely critical, the constructional ones never being written. A further book of physiological interest we owe to Haldane ("Organism and Environment." Oxford, University Press, 1917). This deals with breathing in its various aspects, regulation, and its readjustment in disease, and in relation to internal and external

environment. Of these matters it furnishes a very useful summary. The results of the examination of the eyes of birds by means of the ophthalmoscope are recorded in a well-illustrated volume by Wood ("The Fundus Oculi of Birds, Especially as Viewed by the Ophthalmoscope." Chicago, The Lakeside Press, 1917). From the point of view of the student of outdoor Biology a volume on dragonflies by Tillyard ("The Biology of Dragonflies, Odonata or Paraneuroptera," Cambridge, University Press, 1917) is decidedly welcome. The subject is treated in the broadest possible manner and the laboratory side is also dealt with fully. Useful instructions are given in such diverse matters as the collection of specimens, the identification of species, their geographical distribution and the necessary technique for making microscopical preparations of various parts. A breezy account of adventures after whales and bears is to be found in a volume by Murdoch ("Modern Whaling and Bear-hunting." London, Seeley, Service & Co., 1917). It makes good reading and furnishes a description of a modern whaler, in part designed by the author, and its equipment as well as the life of the men on board. A much-needed plea to people in these islands to support this industry, which is not merely lucrative but of considerable economic importance, is well put forward. Unfortunately, an attempt to open up an industry in the Seychelle Islands had to be suspended owing to the war.

Looking back broadly over the year's work, it will be seen that in spite of the demands on the personnel of the Biologists and the blighting influence of the war, generally a very fair amount of work has been done. It is to be doubted whether the coming year will be more fruitful, since more service will be demanded of American scientists and even of those in Britain, and further, when peace is declared, some little time must elapse before normal conditions of work can be re-established. Fortunately, signs are not lacking that a marked revival of interest on the part of the general public in matters scientific will take place, and in this Biology too, one of the most fascinating branches of inquiry, will undoubtedly share. The intention of the Government to aid in the prosecution of research is an undoubted and much-needed advance. If it is carried out in a sympathetic spirit and on generous lines, as it appears to have started, it will enable more investigations to be conducted than formerly. This attitude will need to be backed by the Universities and Colleges, however, for in them the younger members of the scientific staffs are none too generously treated.

ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

I ART

ACTIVITY rather than achievement characterised the world of art and artists throughout the year. Along with others of less importance, the National Gallery acquired the following pictures. "The Philosopher," an early signed work by Rembrandt (purchased out of the Temple West Fund); "The Sacrifice of Isaac," by Piazzetta (presented by Mr. Robert Witt through the National Art Collections Fund), the first example of this rare master to be included in the Collection, and two valuable panels of single "Angels," by Pesellino one of these being bequeathed by Lady Brownlow, the other being acquired by purchase from Lord Somers. Both fragments are sections of a well-known picture bought by the National Gallery in 1863 (No Catalogue 727), a third portion is still in the Royal Collection, where it was identified by the late Herbert Horne, who indeed ingeniously reconstructed the scattered altar-piece. Hopes are entertained that this third piece may be eventually reunited to the dismembered "Trinita," only one section of which will then be missing. Throughout the year various works of interest from Bridgewater House and other sources were exhibited on loan in Trafalgar Square. One gallery was hung for a short time with a remarkable display of the Pre-Raphaelites (brought from the Tate, which remained closed). These more than held their own against the contemporary French and earlier English Schools in the adjacent galleries. Owing to anticipated increase of danger from air-raids, at a subsequent date all the more valuable items in the National Collection were removed from Trafalgar Square and Millbank to a place of safety at present undivulged. In March the Treasury, acting on the recommendation of the "National Gallery Committee Report" (cf. A.R., 1915, p. 119), appointed a separate Board of Trustees for the Tate Gallery (officially designated as Additional Trustees of the National Gallery), consisting of Lord Plymouth, Lord D'Abernon, Mr. Robert Witt (already Trustees of the National Gallery); Mr. C. J. Holmes (Director of the National Gallery), Mr. D. S. MacColl (Director of the Wallace Collection), Mr. John Sargent, R.A., Mr. J. R. Holliday, Lord Henry Bentinck, Mr. Robert Ross, and Mr. Charles Aitken (Director of the Tate). Mr. Sargent, who was in America at the time, after accepting membership, resigned by cable. In July a number of presidents of societies of artists, headed by Sir Edward Poynter, P.R.A., memorialised the Treasury in a protest (published in the Press on July 17) directed against the personnel of the newly constituted Board. The memorial recorded "the gravest misgiving at the absence of members directly

and adequately representing the artists of this country." Questions on the subject of the memorial were asked in the House of Commons at different dates; but neither in Press nor Parliament was much sympathy evinced for the memorialists. Among acquisitions to the Tate were some thirty pictures of the more advanced schools, which included the "Smiling Woman" of Augustus John, generally considered his masterpiece (presented by the Contemporary Art Society); two exquisite water-colours by Madox Brown, "The Reading Lesson" and "King René's Honeymoon" (purchased at the Colart sale, Liverpool); "The Plough," by Frederick Walker, a large, popular, but insignificant work (presented by Lady Wernher through the National Art Collections Fund), which had been purchased at an inflated price (5670*l.*) from the Red Cross sale; "Portrait of the Painter," by Henry Tonks (presented through the National Art Collections Fund by Mr. Hugh Hammersley). This last gift was singularly appropriate, for it anticipated by only a few weeks the excellent appointment of Mr. Tonks to the Slade Professorship of Fine Art, rendered vacant by the retirement of Professor Brown. For many years Mr. Tonks has been the assistant teacher at the Slade; his influence and training have left their mark on some of the most brilliant and successful of the younger painters. The chief acquisition of the British Museum was the famous "Orestes" vase from the Hope Collection at Deepdene. Though celebrated in the annals of connoisseurship, modern archaeologists do not rate the piece at the high estimate of our forefathers, who would, however, have been astonished at the price for which it changed hands at Christie's (1134*l.*) It belongs to the fourth century B.C., a relatively late date for Greek ceramics. The generosity of the National Art Collections Fund again assisted in the purchase. The Department of Mediaeval Antiquities received from Messrs. Hampton some large and valuable Chinese sculptures of the Han dynasty; the Department of Prints and Drawings a gift of English mezzotints, engravings and drawings from Lady Lucas. Other valuable gifts were made by the National Art Collections Fund to the British, Victoria and Albert, and other Museums and Galleries.

In January, for the first time in its history, the Royal Academy devoted its galleries to an exhibition of black-and-white work. All kinds of graving, and drawing without colour, were represented; the experiment proved a failure. The absence of colour no less than the absence of any principle of selection in some measure accounted for the absence of the public. While the walls were overcrowded, the galleries throughout the exhibition were unhappily empty. Two of them devoted to Old Masters and to English draughtsmen of the Sixties respectively, excited languid interest among connoisseurs; but even here there was little evidence that any selective power was exercised. In fairness, however, it must be said that the rooms in Burlington House are unsuitable for the display of works on a small scale. The summer exhibition was distinguished by a number of portraits by Mr. Orpen; that of Lady Bonham-Carter (No. 29) being especially admired. Mr. Charles Shannon surpassed himself in "The Man with a Greek Vase" (No. 62), and Mr. D. Y. Cameron with "A Street Scene, Chartres" (No. 608), for the purchase of which there were

several competitors. The general satisfaction expressed at the Chantrey Trustees' selection of Mr Glyn Philpott's beautiful "Young Breton" (No. 258) at 500*l.* was sadly discounted by their other purchases. "Forward the Guns" (No. 706) at 1000*l.*, by Miss Lucy Kemp-Welch (already represented in the Chantrey Collection) is a vast, clever canvas on which opinions differ. The superfluity of its acquisition provoked much hostile criticism. Of the two pieces of sculpture, "The Sacristan" (No. 1613) for 90*l.*, by Edward Lanteri, and "The Critic" (No. 1617) for 100*l.*, by C. Webb Gilbert, it is better to let posterity speak. On April 26 Sir Ernest George, Architect, was elected a Royal Academician, and S. Melton Fisher an Associate, on December 10 Frederick W. Pomeroy, Sculptor, a Royal Academician.

The New English Art Club Winter and Summer Exhibitions hardly maintained their usual level of excellence, apart from some fine works by Mr Wilson Steer. The exhibition of Mr. Augustus John at the Alpine Club in November converted a new section of the public to an appreciation of our greatest draughtsman, though his limitations, always recognised by his friendly critics, were too evident. It must be confessed that he seems unwilling to carry out his superb schemes for pictures in which too often there is a hint of great achievement rather than accomplishment of purpose. At the Leicester Galleries, in February, Mr Epstein, the sculptor, attracted some hostile attention, but his originality and power were generously praised, Mr. Nevinson in September repeating his success of last year with further war pictures. At the Grafton Galleries in December was seen a characteristic number of Mestrovic's works, together with those of a new Serb-Croat sculptor, Rosandic. Hardly enough justice was done to the latter's charm in treatment, powerful imagination, and technical accomplishment. At Messrs. Wallis & Son's Gallery in Pall Mall there opened a posthumous exhibition of the Dutch artist Matthew Maris's work on November 8. It would be idle to pretend that the extraordinary reputation enjoyed by the painter in the last century was in any way fortified or confirmed. For many years Maris was a recluse resident in London where he died, and a good deal of unnecessary mystery had accumulated about his art and personality.

The autumn exhibition at the Grosvenor was particularly delightful, the loan of Mrs Charles Hunter's small but choice collection of modern painters being one of the principal features. Fascinating portraits in oil and water-colour by Mr Ambrose McEvoy, and an exquisite series of caricatures of the Pre-Raphaelites by Mr Max Beerbohm, drew large crowds. The excellence of "Max" emphasised once more the poverty in humour and execution of all our political and war cartoons, whether of the comic or serio-comic press. Kindly feeling will hardly serve as an excuse for these singular lacunæ in the graphic talent of modern British draughtsmen.

In September a good many people were startled by the internment of Mr. Philip Laszlo, the naturalised Hungarian portrait painter. It is to be regretted that, on insufficient data, numbers of persons expressed their judgment of the case according to their appreciation or dislike of the painter's talent, which had nothing to do with a political contingency.

In May an action in the Courts brought by Mr Huntington, of New York, against the firm of Messrs. Lewis & Simmons, Art Dealers, usurped public interest indeed, the war and the political situation were almost forgotten in the excitement. The subject of dispute was a large full-length portrait of two ladies, supposed to be the daughters of Mrs. Siddons and attributed to Romney, under which name it had been sold for £20,000 by the defendants. So long ago as September 14, 1912, *The Times* had announced the discovery of this new "Romney" with much enthusiasm. It was guaranteed by Mr Humphrey Ward, the critic of *The Times*, who in the course of the case testified along with a number of other critics and well-known painters to the authenticity of the attribution. The plaintiff's witnesses included Sir Luke Fildes, R.A., Sir Edward Poynter, P.R.A., and Sir Walter Armstrong, the critic, who firmly denied the alleged ascription. The suit was heard before Justices Darling, Lush, and Sankey without a jury: Sir John Simon appeared for the plaintiff, Mr. Leslie Scott for the defendants. It occupied eight days. On May 23 Mr. Leslie Scott produced a photograph of an original signed drawing for the picture by Ozias Humphrey (the well-known miniature painter) which had been discovered in the Library of the Royal Academy, and he notified to the Court the willingness of his clients to cancel the sale of the picture. The good faith of the defendant dealers was thereby entirely vindicated; themselves having produced the evidence which concluded the case. A significant and at the same time amusing aspect of the trial was the complete exposure of the iterated claim of painters that they and they alone are good judges of pictures, no less than that of dogmatic experts who regard themselves as infallible. On the suggestion of Mr. Justice Darling, the picture was offered subsequently as a gift to the National Gallery but was very properly refused. Except as a souvenir of human folly, it possessed no interest whatever. The portraits were afterwards discovered by Mr. Whitley to be those of the Hon. Misses Waldegrave.

Another case passed almost unnoticed, though of more importance, at least to the public purse. This was the appeal of the Layard family before the House of Lords in March on the construction of the bequest of Sir Henry Layard's pictures, other than portraits, to the National Gallery (*cf. A.R.*, 1916, p. 135, and *The Times*, March 14, 1917). The appellant claimed fifteen items by various old masters in the collection; the Trustees of the National Gallery contending that they were not "portraits" within the meaning of the bequest. In the Court of first instance and in the Court of Appeal the decision was given in favour of the National Gallery. Before the House of Lords had delivered their judgment, Sir Frederick Smith, the Attorney-General, effected a compromise which involved the payment by the Exchequer to the family of 17,000*l.* in lieu of the pictures, which were to be retained by the nation. This sum was greatly in excess of their value.

Prices at Christie's ruled higher than they had ever done before. The actual masterpieces offered for sale were few, but extraordinary figures were reached for secondary pictures and objects of art. Certain economists ascribe the circumstance to the purchasing power of the

sovereign being much less than in pre-war times. There is good reason to believe that new fortunes, acquired from the manufacture of war material, were partly responsible, and the general belief that works of art form a good investment free of income tax. Foreign dealers from neutral countries purchased on a large scale, both at the shops and in the auction rooms, and this, too, must be reckoned with in any scrutiny of figures. The record for pictures is 25,410*l.*, given by Sir Thomas Dewar on July 6, 1917, for Raeburn's "Portrait of the MacNab." This work has long enjoyed an exaggerated reputation. Gainsborough's "Crossing the Stieam," in the Jardine sale on March 16, carried the next but more modest record at 7,980*l.* At the Beecham sale on May 3, Turner's "Constance" fetched 4,500*l.*, exceeding any previous auction record for any water-colour by this artist. Seventy years ago it was purchased by Ruskin for 88*l.*

The Hope heirlooms, consisting chiefly of Greek and Roman antiquities, some in very bad condition, attracted huge crowds to Christie's. While very large prices were given for the Greek vases, the marble figures which made the collection world-famous, brought relatively little at the sale on July 23. A more exact knowledge of archaeology enables the modern expert to distinguish between real Greek work of the fifth and fourth century B.C., and Graeco-Roman or Alexandrian copies. The great "Athena," formerly ascribed to Pheidias, in *Carara* marble, had been terribly tinkered in the last century by Canova. It fetched 7,140*l.* The "Antinous," of its kind the finest of the life-size figures, an original work of the second century A.D., in unusually good condition, the head being intact on the shoulders, was bought for 5,880*l.*; "Hygeia," one of the few real Greek pieces, 4,200*l.* The Ashmolean at Oxford obtained, it was said, judicious and excellent bargains.

Messrs. Sotheby's, the famous firm of Wellington Street, Strand, opened their new premises in Bond Street on May 29. Here was held the sale of the Pembroke drawings from Wilton; the prices were high, certain ancient armour from the same source was much discussed prior to proposed sale but was withdrawn, owing to historical doubts cast on its historical provenance.

For Obituaries *cf.* pp 151-208

II DRAMA.

The greatest theatrical event of the year was not a gain but a loss—the death of Sir Herbert Tree. Sir Herbert succeeded Sir Henry Irving, none the less completely because it was without formal acknowledgement, in the headship of the English stage. Like Irving he excelled in character acting of the romantic kind, like Irving he mingled deftly artistic with social obligations, like Irving he lavished on the spectacular and merely costly side of his productions thought which sometimes was a little wanting in more essential matters. The two men differed in that while Irving was first and foremost an actor and took his profession with infinite seriousness, Tree delighted in and succeeded in impressing the world with his position as a wit and a man of the world. He was the most decorative figure in London since Disraeli. When he

died he left no immediate successor in the leadership of the London stage.

Surveying the theatre as a whole during 1917, students of the drama find little in the way of main currents to trace. *Revue*, which had been in the ascendant in 1916, suffered a rapid decline. At the Alhambra Theatre, where it had perhaps its most successful previous innings, it suffered the fate which seems to await all sequels. "The Bing Girls Are There" was a dull and ineffectual production compared to its predecessor, and survived for a time by virtue of one or two songs (written by Mr. Nat D. Ayer) and the acting of Miss Violet Loraine, who had proved herself to possess the genius for this kind of playing more markedly than anyone else in London. Others were more successful, notably "Cheep," "Round the Map," "Hanky Panky," and "Zig Zag" (illuminated by Mr. George Robey), but the palm must be awarded to "Bubbly," at the Comedy Theatre, which at the end of the year after a run of eight months was still at the height of its prosperity. In this *revue*, housed in a comparatively small theatre which enabled the audience to feel a kind of *rapport* with the actors, which is the salt of this kind of entertainment, more wit and social satire were packed than is customary, with the happiest possible results. It reinforced the reputation of Mr. Arthur Playfair as a comedian and the remarkable capacity in dance of Miss Phyllis Monkman. One of its happiest features was a return to the kind of theatrical burlesque brought to a fine art by the late Mr. Pellisier and his company. Altogether it was a conspicuously successful production, enabling other theatres, notably the Palace, to slide peacefully into a revival of musical comedy of the type which was popular several years before. Whether this reversion is likely to be more than temporary it is still too early to say. At the end of the year it appeared to be fortunate, and whereas only one theatre was playing this kind of show in January no less than six were in December.

Enough has been said about the more popular forms of entertainment; let us turn to the drama itself. The most memorable feature of the year in this respect was, without doubt, the sudden interest created by the work of the French dramatist Brieux. A society which formed itself to produce one of his cruder plays, "Damaged Goods," actuated no doubt by what were conceived to be social rather than artistic motives, succeeded in getting the play licensed by the Lord Chamberlain. Equally fortunately they succeeded in getting it produced in a theatre (the Ambassador's) exactly suited by its size for a work which depended for its effect on an intimate contact between actors and spectators. The result was a striking success, and Brieux and the sociological drama generally became popular idols. Those who regarded the success of "Damaged Goods" as residing in its subject matter welcomed a revival of "Ghosts," at the Kingsway Theatre. Those who had become interested in the author crowded to the production of "The Three Daughters of M. Dupont," at the St. Martin's Theatre, where a fine actress, Miss Ethel Irving, enjoyed perhaps the greatest triumph of her career. As an exhibition of passionate abandon her performance has rarely been equalled, and it deserved thoroughly every praise bestowed upon it. Our English dramatists were less fortunate. Mr. Galsworthy's

"Foundations," a charming and clever thing which deserved better luck than it received, ran for less than three weeks, while Mr. Shaw confined himself to some trivial exercises in the art of acknowledged and anonymous farce mainly performed by the Stage and other societies. As for Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, his unfortunate experiment, "The Pacifists," which was designed to enforce the lesson of the war by the dramatisation of a conflict in a somewhat impossible village society, was atoned for by a subsequent revival of his best work, "The Liars," which did not, however, have a long run. After Sir J. M. Barrie's "Dear Brutus," which began so late as almost to belong to 1918, the best play of the year seemed unquestionably "Anthony in Wonderland," a piece of delicate and ingenious comedy which was produced and played by Mr. Charles Hawtrey and enjoyed considerable success. The most successful was "Seven Days' Leave," a melodrama which was produced in February at the Lyceum Theatre and was still running at the end of the year. Other war plays had varying fortunes. "The Man Who Went Abroad" lasted only a short time, whereas "Inside the Lines," a spy play about Gibraltar, after some initial hesitancy developed into a steady popularity which at the end of the year showed no signs of diminishing. "Loyalty" contained too much argument and too little action to be successful even if its types had been truer to life than they were. "The Better 'Ole," though perhaps it had little dramatic merit, caught the public taste by its association with the work of a well-known draughtsman, and with the expert assistance of Mr. Bourchier looked like settling down to a long run. Partly, no doubt, owing to war conditions, plays bordering on the supernatural attracted considerable attention. One of them, "The Invisible Foe," depended, perhaps, on an attraction too subtle to ensure it a wide appeal, another, "The 13th Chair," contrived a nice balance between the subtle and the melodramatic which attracted the public, helped no doubt by the incomparable aid of Mrs. Patrick Campbell.

It would be ungrateful to catalogue the more striking failures, two plays which belonged to the previous year, "Romance," and "A Little Bit of Fluff," continued running. In the provinces, the year saw the close, temporarily, for the war, of one of the most striking dramatic experiments of our time—Miss Horniman's repertory theatre in Manchester.

III. MUSIC.

Music in 1917 was in this condition that the standard of measurement, so to speak, was not so much music *per se* as music when compared with that of the previous year. In the two previous years of the war the musical shadow of the days of peace was still sufficiently well-defined to leave its impression. But in 1917 the old order had almost disappeared, the shadow of peace times had well-nigh evaporated, and things were—or seemed to be—starting off from a new basis. This, of course, is, plainly, all to the good, even if it is a little superficial. For, as a fact, no musician, save possibly one, and no music, save perhaps one work, no singer, no instrumentalist, burst upon the horizon of

the recorder of our contemporary musical activities with such resolution as to mark the particular epoch without any reservation, mental or otherwise. And yet, in spite of this, there is no denying the fact that in London at least music stood upon a plane higher than before, since August, 1914. The pre-war shadow was less clearly defined because the old foreign ingredient was naturally less in evidence. But this is only a half-truth in that assuredly the evaporation of the foreign shadow and the development of the native substance were not really the result of the apparently obvious cause and effect. Native music has never been, in two centuries or more, more full of promise than now or in the last few years, no new fact, perhaps; but there is something new in the point that the fact itself was beginning to be understood by the public in 1917 for the first time in many years. And this is the point to be emphasised in this record—that even if native music were in *status quo*, which is hardly true, the question of its appreciation was not. it was riper and more decided. That to a large extent is the key-note of Music in 1917.

Unquestionably the prime factor of London musical life was the operatic activity of Sir Thomas Beecham in his seasons at the Aldwych Theatre and subsequently at Drury Lane, of which latter Theatre he had obtained a lease, the former theatre, his own, having proved too small to accommodate his ever-increasing audience. January, 1917, saw the continuation of the season at the Aldwych, begun in the previous autumn. This closed on February 10, and on May 30 Beecham entered into possession of Drury Lane, which he opened with a remarkable performance, in English, of Verdi's "Otello," with Frank Mullings (Othello), Frederick Austin (Iago) and Mignon Nevada (Desdemona). In rapid succession there followed Puccini's "Girl of the Golden West," a good melodrama hampered by music, in which Robert Parker (a most valuable, American, addition to the company), Walter Hyde, and Jeanne Brola did well, "Tristan and Isolde," with Mullings and Rosina Buckman as the protagonists, "Louise" (Miriam Licette), "Samson and Delila" (Walter Hyde and Edna Thornton); "Boris Godunov," "Madame Butterfly," "La Bohème," "Cavalleria Rusticana," "Pagliacci," "Tosca," "Faust," even "Il Trovatore," and much else that belongs to the conventional and necessary operatic repertory. But there were other matters of really greater importance. The revival of "The Marriage of Figaro," sumptuously mounted and dressed, with the English version of the libretto entirely rewritten by Edwin Evans who based it on Beaumarchais, was the most important single operatic venture in many a long day. Then the first London performance of Bizet's early opera, "The Fair Maid of Perth," a delightful, fragrant work, must be recorded as a success although a considerable amount of adverse criticism assailed it from those who were constitutionally devoid of the historic sense. This season, in which the conductors were Beecham, Percy Pitt, Eugene Goossens, junr., came to an end in July. On September 22 it was followed by another also at Drury Lane in which, while the main features of the repertory were inevitably as before, there was a most welcome addition in Rimsky-Korsakov's "Ivan the Terrible" (Pskovityanka), now sung for the first time in English.

Here again, as in "Boris," Robert Parker was superb in the title-role. Meanwhile the Royal Carl Rosa Company had made bold, after a long absence, to return to London, where, at the Garrick on May 3, they began a season so successful that later the company transferred to the Shaftesbury, where the season ended on July 7. During this period they played the usual contemporary repertory (largely enumerated above), but added a revival of Bruneau's "Attack on the Mill." Ben Davies returned to the stage for the revival of "Maritana," and "The Bohemian Girl." "The Magic Flute," "The Lily of Killarney," and "The Merry Wives of Windsor" also were in the scheme. In all of these separate and distinct opera seasons the two outstanding features were the growing excellence of the performers through the wider experience of the English singers, and the palpable increase in interest of the more serious opera-goers.

Nor was there any less activity in the concert world. The Royal Philharmonic Society began its 105th Season with its 792nd Concert there were six concerts in all, most generously supported if not actually made possible, by Beecham, who himself conducted five of the concerts, the sixth being in the hands of Landon Ronald. Not much salvation was sought in actual novelty. Yet the following new works were produced: Frederic Austin's Symphonic poem "Palsgaard," and Edward German's song "Have you news of my boy Jack?" Delius, Bantock, Elgar, Pitt, and Ethel Smyth were among the Native Composers represented, while among foreigners were Debussy, Franck, Chabrier, Ravel, Saint-Saens, Balakirev, Glinka (a long selection from whose "A life for the Tsar" was given), Grechaninov, Rachmaninov, and Rimsky-Korsakov. Only "classical" German music was played—music, that is, by deceased composers Pachmann, Ysaye, Clara Butt, Kirkby Lunn, Randalow, Licette, and Blamey were among the soloists. Although the R.P.S.'s season was shorter than used to be the case, not so that of the New Queen's Hall Orchestra. In their season of 1916-17 they gave fourteen symphony and twenty-six Sunday concerts, all of which were conducted by Sir Henry J. Wood; and at each of the symphony concerts a new work was produced. Among these were Granados's "Dante," Turina's "Procession du Rocio," Albeniz's "Catalonia" (revised), also Pierné's "Les Cathedrales," Dubois's "In Memoriam Mortuorum," Rabeaud's "La Procession Nocturne," and Roussel's "Les dieux dans l'ombre des Cavernes." Two British works, W. H. Reed's caprice "Will o' the Wisp," and Frank Bridge's Two Poems for Orchestra, were produced, as were four by Russian composers, namely, Rimsky-Korsakov's "Tsar Saltan" suite, Kalinikov's overture "Tsar Boris," Ostroglazov's "Apocalypse," and Cherepnin's pianoforte concerto, superbly played by the Russian pianist, Moiseivich. The annual season of Promenade Concerts began in Queen's Hall, with the aid of the above orchestra on August 25, Sir Henry Wood conducting. At them several unfamiliar compositions by George Butterworth (killed in the war), John Ireland, Waldo Warner, Percy Buck, Norman O'Neill, Montague Phillips, Dora Bright, and Howard Carr were played.

The London Symphony Orchestra relied almost entirely upon familiar music for their thirteenth season, of which the conductors were Safonov,

Beecham, and Hamilton Harty, the only important novelties being Bantock's Hebridean Symphony and de Greef's pianoforte concerto, played by the composer the same evening (March 19). The L.S.O. abandoned their Autumn season in 1917, but gave Sunday concerts, chiefly under Mr Julian Clifford's conductorship at the Palladium. The Royal Choral Society had a successful if conventional season under Sir Frederick Bridge in the Albert Hall, and besides the usual oratorios sung Elgar's "For the Fallen," and Parry's "Chivalry of the Sea." Landon Ronald continued with much success his Sunday concerts in the same hall.

Almost more in the realms of chamber music than elsewhere, save in opera in English, was the advance noticeable that is referred to above. The London String Quartet added greatly to their previously earned laurels, and gave season after season of charming "Pops" in *Æolian* Hall, finally opening a series in Queen's Hall in December. "The London Trio," and a new organisation, "A London Trio," were in evidence, and during the Autumn Isidore de Lara gave his 800th War Emergency Concert, when he announced that he had produced upwards of 200 new English compositions at these concerts. The Chappell and London Ballad Concerts held on their way. At the former Aleck Maclean conducted as a regular feature a delightful small orchestra, and the programmes were often far in advance of those of other days in musical interest. And among other societies deserving of notice for good work were the Bach Choir, the Oriana Madrigal Society, the Alexandra Palace Society, and the Gwynne Kimpton Orchestra.

As individual composers shone out during the year Elgar, through his complete war composition "The Spirit of England," and John Ireland by a number of compositions in most genres—save opera—and the arrival of two violinists so capable as Sybil Eaton and Tessie Thomas should assuredly be recorded.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1917.

IF the advent of another year of war found us apparently as much in doubt as to the probable duration of the great clash of arms as we were a year ago, we had at least the satisfaction of knowing that, as regards financial resources, it found the Allies more definitely supreme than they ever were. With the formidable bulwark of American resources standing behind those of her European Allies the financial outlook gave no reason for any anxiety. Domestic finance is a simple problem, but international finance is a totally different matter when the exchanges are heavily against you. That is the real problem of finance in war time, and that is why the intervention of the United States formed one of the two outstanding economic features of a very eventful year.

On more than one occasion in the past Mr. Bonar Law as Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that while we could not go on spending money at the rate at which it was now being consumed, he believed that our resources were sufficient to outlast those of the enemy. That belief became an assured conviction with the entry of the United States into the war. Her intervention altered in a fundamental respect the whole aspect of the international exchanges, and the basis of the major portion of the borrowing which it has been necessary to effect abroad. Until then funds were placed at the disposal of the Allies on a purely business footing, at a high rate of interest, and on the basis of collateral security. As a result we were compelled to mobilise all our American securities, and a number of others, and had that source of collateral security become exhausted, as it would have done in time, we should have been confronted with another perplexing problem. But since April the United States Government placed at the disposal of the Allies all the money required for purchasing the enormous amount of war equipment and food-stuffs required at rates of interest much below those formerly paid. Down to the end of the year not much less than 1,000,000,000*l.* had been lent by the United States Government to the Allies in this manner.

The other predominant feature of the year was the new policy followed by the British Government in providing the funds needed to finance the war. On taking office as Chancellor Mr Bonar Law decided to reverse the policy of his predecessor, who had too long depended upon high money rates to regulate the exchanges, which had raised the cost of all financing, and compelled him to rely mainly upon the creation of floating debt to finance expenditure. The first step taken by Mr. Bonar Law was to suspend the sale of the 6 per cent. Exchequer Bonds and also of Treasury Bills in preparation for the issue of a long-term loan. This loan, issued between January 11 and February 16 in the form of 5 per

cent stock at 95, redeemable in 1929-47, and 4 per cent tax-compounded stock at 100, redeemable in 1929-42, was remarkably successful, no less than 941,476,710*l.* in cash being received. With the conversion of the old 4½ per cents., Exchequer Bonds, Treasury Bills, and War Expenditure Certificates, the total of the 5 per cent. loan was 2,066,988,384*l.* and of the 4 per cent. loan 52,418,250*l.* Apart from the higher credit basis on which the loan was raised, the operation ranked as the greatest achievement of its kind in history. In April a new issue of 5 per cent. Exchequer Bonds, redeemable in 1922, or in 1919 at the option of the holder, was made at par, a conversion right being given into any new loan. Although these bonds were placed on tap daily the response from investors was not very gratifying, only 82 millions being sold down to September 22 when the issue was suspended, and a new form of loan was resorted to. This took the form of 5 per cent. National War Bonds, issued at par, and redeemable in five, seven, and ten years at premiums of 2, 3, and 5 per cent. respectively. Thanks to the fresh energy put into propaganda work, and to the invaluable services of the wandering Tanks, used as subscription banks, the issue was a distinct success, and grew in popularity every week. From October 2, when the sales began, down to December 29, the total amount sold was considerably over two hundred millions. The sale of Treasury Bills suspended on January 4 was resumed on March 30, when a conversion was made to the tender system. A sum of 335,000,000*l.* of bills was sold by this method down to June 19, when the system of daily sales at fixed prices was again adopted. At first the discount rate was fixed at 4½ per cent. for three and six months' bills—the only bills placed on offer—but on July 3 it was raised to 4¾ per cent. and that figure was adhered to until December 27, when the rate was lowered to 4 per cent. On balance during the year 56,974,000*l.* of Treasury Bills were paid off, as against a net issue in 1916 of 719,584,000*l.*, the amount outstanding on December 31 last being 1,058,175,000*l.* Not only was the war financed on a lower interest basis during the year, but the financing was done mainly by long-term borrowing instead of by creating short indebtedness. The resultant saving to the nation of this more preferable form of finance completely justified the Chancellor's policy.

As in the previous year, the money market was entirely dominated by the borrowing operations of the Government. The year opened with the Bank Rate at 6 per cent., but on January 18, a week after the issue of the War Loan prospectus, it was lowered to 5½ per cent., and on April 5 it was reduced ½ per cent. further to 5 per cent., at which level it remained for the rest of the year. Money rates, however, did not follow so closely the course which had been anticipated owing to lack of proper co-ordination between the policy of the Bank and the market. At the beginning of the year the Bank of England allowed 5 per cent. on special three-day deposits made by the clearing banks, on February 26 the rate—which was a more effective factor in controlling the value of money in Lombard Street than Bank Rate was—was reduced to 4¾ per cent., and on June 19 to 4 per cent. But the banks whose deposits had been depleted by the War Loan subscriptions kept their deposit rates at 4 per cent. though it is customary for them to be 1½ per cent. below Bank Rate. Although money rates were on a lower level than in 1916, the year was a very profitable one for the banks and discount houses. Bank Rate averaged

5*l.* 3*s* 1*½d* per cent. against 5*l.* 9*s* 5*d*, the three months' bill rate 4*l.* 7*s.* 11*d* against 5*l.* 3*s.* 8*d*, deposit rates 4*l.* 2*s* 6*d.* against 3*l.* 14*s* 8*d*, and day-to-day loans 4*l.* 1*s* 5*d.* against 4*l.* 8*s* 5*d.* per cent. But though the margins were narrower, the enormous volume of credits created by the Government enabled the money market to find full employment for its funds, and as these were distributed as fast as they were needed by the Government, the end of the year found the banks in possession of unprecedentedly large amounts of deposits. As in 1916 the special deposit rate allowed by the Bank governed the value of short loans, and the Treasury Bill Rate the discount market, but this artificial condition, which made a "free" money market impossible had very distinct advantages from both the market's and the Government's point of view. Towards the end of the year the experiment was tried of offering a special rate for foreign funds employed here, 4*½* per cent being allowed on such deposits made with the Bank through the clearing bankers. The experiment worked very satisfactorily, and is likely to be continued as long as the neutral exchanges remain adverse to us. As regards the foreign exchange market, United States dollars remained at the uniform level of \$4 76*½* to the £, while the value of the franc improved gradually to 27 21 francs to the pound. Of course the rouble depreciated heavily, Petrograd exchange being quoted at 362 roubles per 10*l* against a normal rate of 94 57. The Italian débâcle caused a heavy fall in the lira, but the Scandinavian exchanges after showing an appreciation of about 20 to 25 per cent. moved again in our favour later, on rumours of an early peace.

The enormous monetary turnover of the year was reflected in the Clearing House returns, which showed the record total of 19,121,196,000*l.*, an increase of 3,846,150,000*l.* The year was notable for the extension of the policy of amalgamation in the banking world. The most important event of the kind was the fusion of the National Provincial Bank of England and the Union of London and Smiths, under the title of the National Provincial and Union Bank of England, which was arranged very quietly by the respective chairmen—Lord Inchcape and Sir Felix Schuster. The next important fusion was that of the London and South-Western Bank and the London and Provincial. The National and Provincial also acquired an equal interest in the Lloyds Bank French subsidiary, while the London and South-Western established relations with an Italian Bank. The London City and Midland and the London County and Westminster Banks invaded Ireland by absorbing two Irish Banks, the former purchasing control of the Belfast Banking Company, and the latter the Ulster Bank. The Westminster also established branches in Spain. In May the British Trade Bank, the formation of which had been recommended by the Faringdon Committee, was incorporated by Royal Charter, and began active business shortly afterwards under the title of the British Trade Corporation. Some of the big banks subscribed to the capital, which was fixed at 10,000,000*l.*, of which about one quarter was issued. This event had the effect of encouraging the great banks to consider the possibilities of co-operation among themselves in financing the trade of the country after the war.

Banking profits were very satisfactory, and, owing to the absence of any depreciation in investments, for the first time for many years, dividends in some cases were increased, but generally the banks preferred to strengthen their reserves in order to meet possible future contingencies.

On the Stock Exchange the principal feature was the check given to depreciation in fixed interest stocks as the result of the Government's policy of cheapening money. If we ignore the heavy fall in American securities, which ensued after the U.S. entry into the war, we find that Stock Exchange values of 387 representative securities rose in the aggregate by 2,000,000*l.*, against a fall of 149,000,000*l.* in 1916. In January the Treasury decided to requisition those securities which had not been sold or lent to the Government, and this had the effect of practically extinguishing what remained of the American market here, so that the depreciation in the latter—about 160,000,000*l.*—scarcely affected British investors. There was very marked activity in industrial securities, owing to the high prices of commodities which enabled the companies to earn large profits and generally to pay increased dividends. The outstanding feature was the buying of brewery stocks, rises in which quite overshadowed those in other securities. For instance, Watney, Combe deferred stock rose 73*l.* to 84*l.*, City of London ordinary 61*1/2**l.* to 90*1/2**l.*, and Guinness stock 67*l.* to 297*l.* Foreign securities were also distinctly firmer, especially Scandinavian stocks, owing to the big profit to be made on exchange on their sale back to Scandinavian investors. Brazilian securities underwent a substantial improvement on the resumption of cash payments on the External Debt at the expiration of the funding period in August last. Russian securities naturally sustained a very heavy fall, though no default was allowed to occur on that part of Russia's debt held here or in France.

Comparisons of oversea trade were vitiated by the fact that for the second half of the year most Government goods were included, with the exception of food-stuffs, whereas in 1916 particulars of these movements had been withheld. Subject to this change in calculation, the value of the imports amounted to 1,065,000,000*l.* in 1917, as compared with 948,000,000*l.* in 1916 and 851,000,000*l.* in 1915, the increase of the figures for 1916 being 12 3 per cent. On the same basis, exports were valued at 525,000,000*l.* in 1917, as against 506,000,000*l.* and 384,000,000*l.* in 1916 and 1915 respectively. The increase on 1916 was thus 3 7 per cent. Re-exports, however, declined to 69,000,000*l.* in 1917, as compared with 97,000,000*l.* in 1916 and 99,000,000*l.* in 1915, the reduction as compared with 1916 being as much as 28 7 per cent. Taking into account the figures for re-exports, the revealed adverse balance of trade was raised to 470,000,000*l.*, as compared with 344,000,000*l.* in 1916 and 368,000,000*l.* in 1915. In 1914 the adverse balance, *i.e.* the excess of imports over exports, was only 170,000,000*l.*, and in 1913 only 134,000,000*l.*

With the development of unrestricted submarine warfare, the effective employment of tonnage became of supreme importance. Happily, the foundations for this had been well laid in the creation by Mr. Lloyd George of a Ministry of Shipping. Sir Joseph Maclay, the

Shipping Controller, surrounded himself with a number of the leading shipowners of the country, who concentrated on the various problems connected with the most efficient employment of what shipping was available.

The great majority of ordinary cargo trading vessels having already been requisitioned by the Government, the chief development was the institution of a scheme for the requisitioning of liners. This was carried through after negotiations between the Ministry of Shipping and shipowners. The scheme provided that all liners should be requisitioned by the Government at Blue Book rates, and that owners should continue to manage the vessels themselves, all profits above the Blue-Book rates, after allowing for certain expenses, being handed to the Government. A Committee of owners, on which the Shipping Controller was represented, was appointed for each trade. The plan allowed for the diversion of ships into whichever route they were then most required. The first trades to be brought into this scheme were the Australasian, for which the preliminary arrangements were made in March. Gradually the scheme was extended to other trades until practically all the regular services had been brought under this system of control.

This scheme gave rise to a famous judgment by Mr. Justice Bailhache in December. Mr. Richard Holt, a leading and successful Liverpool owner, who had participated in the negotiations, decided to try the point in Court whether brain craft could be requisitioned. The requisitioning letter of the Shipping Controller had been so worded in a mandatory form that not only had the ships been requisitioned, but it had also appeared that the services of the owners as managers of the ships, and all their organisations at home and abroad had also been requisitioned. The Judge held that while the Shipping Controller had power to requisition the ships, he had no such power to requisition the services of the owners, and, therefore, as the letter of requisition must be construed as a whole, the entire letter must be regarded as *ultra-vires*. He expressed the view, however, that owners should fall in of their own free will and on reasonable terms with such arrangements as the Shipping Controller might think necessary. It was understood that the Ministry of Shipping maintained that it had not been their intention to "commandeer" the services of the owners, but that the wording of the letter in this respect had been a little unfortunate. Many owners were known to have had a shrewd idea that their services could not be requisitioned, but they had agreed to the scheme in the national interest. The immediate result of the legal decision was that the Shipping Controller issued a new letter requisitioning all liners and expressing the hope that owners would continue to manage them. Failing that, the Controller, it was added, must make other arrangements for the management. It was believed that practically all the owners, including Mr. Holt, then formally expressed their willingness to fall in with this scheme.

In some trades freights rose still further during the year, but as practically all British shipping was requisitioned by the Government, these high freights were earned either by the State or by foreign owner-

ships The further strengthening of foreign mercantile marines at the expense of British shipping is one of the present unsatisfactory developments in world commerce. As indicating the profits which were earned, many shipbuilding contracts were placed in this country by Norwegian firms for construction after the war on terms which British owners could not afford to pay Large deposits were made in this country, which were explained by the fact that Norwegian legislation provided that money definitely allocated to new shipping should be free from special Excess Profit taxation All the neutrals earned fabulous profits. Japanese Companies also had a record year, while the building of a large American Mercantile Marine is a factor which will have to be taken into account in future. The profits of British owners were subject to the Excess Profit taxation of 80 per cent., and their trades were entirely controlled.

The volume of premiums taken in the London Marine Insurance market far exceeded anything previously realised. Apart from the high values of ships and commodities, which meant high values for Marine Insurance, a very large amount of War Risk Insurance in respect of British and neutral ships and cargoes was also effected with underwriters. As regards cargo, underwriters often competed with the State scheme, which had been in operation since the outbreak of war, and provided for flat rates of premium, and took the choice risks at rather below the Government rate. Negotiations for an extension of the Government scheme were started in the autumn. As regards ships, there were a number of risks which were not accepted under the Government scheme, and consequently were placed in the market. Many interesting legal points were raised in connection with the exceptional conditions. One of the chief questions was the liability as between the War and Marine Risk underwriters for vessels which became missing without trace. In peace time when vessels became missing, and were posted as such at Lloyd's, the Marine underwriters paid the claims. Since the outbreak of war, there has, however, been a great increase in the number of missing vessels, and it was obvious that the German action in sinking ships without trace was responsible, at any rate, for some of these. Cases were taken into Court, but, in some instances the Judge could only weigh up what evidence there was, and say that this leaned in a certain direction. A system of arbitration was instituted, and was developed at the end of the year with the approval of the Government. This system provided for the apportionment by the arbitrator of the liability for the loss as between the War and Marine Risk underwriters, as seemed fair to him, after hearing all the available evidence. The Admiralty undertook to disclose to an approved arbitrator all information within their power, provided it was not against the public interest to do so, and to assist the arbitrator in every possible way.

A decision of far-reaching importance was given by the House of Lords at the end of October in what was known as the *Kattenturm* case. The *Kattenturm* was the name of a German liner which ran into Messina at the outbreak of war, and the point raised was whether the adventure was frustrated by a peril insured against The plaintiffs, who were the owners of cargo, maintained that the voyage was frustrated by a war

peril covered in the insurance policy, which included the war risk. The underwriters, who were the defendants, maintained, on the other hand, that the captain had taken shelter because of fear of the risk of capture, and that fear of a peril was not a risk insured against. This view was upheld by the Judge. It was pointed out that if the vessel had proceeded on her voyage, she would have encountered marine risks before actually incurring the risk of capture by an Allied cruiser. It should be noted that while the underwriters had repudiated liability for the sheltering of German liners in neutral ports, of which there had been a great many instances, there had been a strong movement to see merchants through their difficulty. In return for a premium covering the goods while in port, underwriters had undertaken to bear any additional cost of transporting the goods to their markets.

The rise in all commodity values meant an increase in the sums insured by Fire Offices. It was obvious that values insured before the war, or even later, would have been quite inadequate to cover owners of property in the event of fire. Many business men, therefore, revised their insurances. The rise in the value of building materials and the cost of labour also meant increased values for house property, while the position was complicated by the restriction placed on building operations. While it was impossible, therefore, always to reinstate property, owners required to be put in the position of being able to rebuild immediately permission was granted. This restriction on building operations gave a great impetus to insurance against consequential loss, or loss of profits, since the risk of owners being unable to continue their business was greatly enhanced. Insurance Companies, however, were very cautious in dealing with this insurance against loss of profits.

The great rise in values probably accounted, to some extent, at any rate, for an increase in the claims. According to *The Times*, the cost of the principal fires in the United Kingdom during the year amounted to 4,066,900*l.*, as compared with losses of 3,300,400*l.* in 1916. In North America, in which British offices are largely interested, losses were very heavy, some large fires being attributed to German incendiarism. There were also some serious fires in munition works, of which the most costly occurred at the Canadian Car Company's works at Kingsland, New Jersey, in January, when property to the value of 2,500,000*l.* was destroyed. In Europe serious losses affecting British offices occurred at Salonika in August, when half the town was destroyed and damage estimated at 4,000,000*l.* was caused, and at Trondhjem, Norway, in July, which resulted in the destruction of stores *en route* from England to Russia valued at 3,000,000*l.* In Sweden, two large fires occurred in November at wood pulp factories, destroying pulp intended for England valued at more than 600,000*l.* In the Far East the principal fire occurred at Vladivostock in March, when American supplies valued at upwards of 2,000,000*l.* were affected.

Life Assurance offices again had a difficult year. The withdrawal of millions of men for the Army meant that the great source from which new business would have emanated was withheld, while their own offices were naturally seriously depleted. A number of offices which published their annual or quinquennial valuations decided to distribute

no bonuses in respect of participating policies. In some cases offices which would normally be valuing five years hence indicated that a valuation might be made earlier, and that the question of bonus distributions would then be considered again. The usual plan was to provide for interim bonuses on a reduced scale in respect of those policies which produced claims before the next valuation. The Industrial Insurance Companies were hard hit. Although most industrial policies had contained a clause specifically excluding war risks, the offices waived the exercise of this clause, and it was estimated that down to the end of 1917 they had paid war claims alone amounting to 4,500,000*l.* They were also, like all Life offices, seriously affected by the depreciation in security values, while it was contended that they were prejudiced by the operation of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Act of 1914. This Act relieved the assured of liability for the payment of premiums as they fell due, provided that the policy holders maintained that owing to the war they were unable to pay the premiums. The Act was passed when an impression prevailed that the war would produce great industrial distress and it is said to have been much abused.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1917.

JANUARY.

2 **Sir Edward Burnett Tylor** was born in 1832 and educated at Grove House, Tottenham, a school belonging to the Society of Friends, of which his parents were members. In 1855 he made a tour in America, and whilst on a visit to Cuba he met the ethnologist Henry Christy, as a result of this meeting he accompanied Christy on an expedition to Mexico, where he found ample opportunity for cultivating his taste in ethnographical and anthropological studies. In 1861 he published an account of these travels under the title of "Anahuac, or Mexico and the Mexicans, Ancient and Modern," and in 1865 he established his reputation as an anthropologist by the publication of "Researches into the Early History of Mankind." In 1871 Tylor's merits were recognised by his election to the Fellowship of the Royal Society, and in 1875 Oxford bestowed upon him the honorary degree of D C L, Cambridge following with an honorary D Sc. thirty years later. In 1883 he was appointed Keeper of the University Museum, and in 1884 Reader in Anthropology at Oxford, and in 1895 he became the first occupant of the Chair of Anthropology in that University, a position which he held until the end of 1909. In 1889-91 he delivered a two years' course of lectures on natural religion under the Gifford Trust at Aberdeen University. In 1884 he presided over the anthropological section at the British Association meeting which was held at Montreal. In 1891 he served as president of the Anthropological Society, which presented him with its Huxley Memorial Medal in 1907. In 1912 he received a knighthood. In addition to his other works he was author of a number of anthropological articles in the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

3 **Sir Howard Warburton Elphinstone** was born in 1831, the eldest son of the second baronet of the same name. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took a scholarship in 1854. He was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn near sixty-five years ago. He became afterwards a lecturer to the Law Society and then Professor of Real Property Law to the Inns of Court. He married in 1860. The heir is a grandson born in 1898.

4 **Oliver H. Jones, D.L.**, the eldest son of the late Mr Robert Oliver Jones, of Fonmon Castle, was born in 1846 and educated at Oxford. He was called to the Bar in 1870. Mr. Jones was Chairman of the South Glamorgan Conservative Association. A descendant of Oliver Cromwell he possessed a remarkable collection of Cromwellean relics.

— **David Robert Lyall, C.S.I.**, was born in 1842. In 1860 he passed into the Indian Civil Service and spent the first twenty years of his service at Dacca. In 1883 he became Inspector-General of Police and afterwards Commissioner of Chittagong. He acted as Political Adviser in the expedition against the Lushais in 1889, receiving the medal with clasps and the C S I. From 1892 he was a member of the Bengal Board of Revenue. He retired in 1896.

— **Captain Frederick Courtenay Selous, D.S.O.**, the famous South African explorer and big-game hunter, was killed in action in East Africa. Born in 1851 he was educated at Rugby and afterwards at Neuchatel and Wiesbaden. At the age of 19 he

left England determined to earn his living as a professional elephant hunter. In 1872 he went into the territory now known as Southern Rhodesia, then terrorised by the Matabele and their chief Lobengula. It was with great difficulty that he gained permission from Lobengula to enter Matabeleland, but when at last he got the desired permission he took advantage of it promptly, and by the time he was 25 he was known far and wide in South Africa as one of the most successful elephant hunters of the day. Until 1881 Selous devoted himself mainly to elephant hunting, in this year he returned home and shortly afterwards published "A Hunter's Wanderings in Africa," a book which ran through five editions and took rank immediately among the classical works on African hunting. He also contributed to the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, which in due time awarded him its gold medal. He returned to the Cape at the end of 1881 determined to give up hunting and devoted himself to procuring specimens of the African fauna, and many of the finest specimens now in the Victoria and Albert Museum were procured by Selous during these years. In 1890 he led the pioneer expedition of the Chartered Company into Mashonaland and so saved that valuable country from Portuguese annexation, and for the next two years he did surveying work for the Chartered Company. In 1893 he published "Travel and Adventure in South-East Africa," and in the same year he assisted in the suppression of the first Matabele insurrection. In 1895 he returned to Rhodesia and was thus in time to serve through the second Matabele War, during which his homestead was burnt by the rebels. In 1896 he embodied these experiences with a review of the causes of the Matabele Wars in a book entitled "Sunshine and Storm in Rhodesia." From this time Selous gratified his ruling passion as big-game hunter and visited Asia Minor, the Rocky Mountains, Newfoundland, and North-Western Canada. In later years he returned to Africa and this time to British East Africa and the Nile. He was a field naturalist of very exceptional qualities and excellence, and these qualities combined with his enormous experience raised him to the position of acknowledged *doyen* of the whole of modern hunters. In 1909-10 he organised and accompanied Mr. Roosevelt's hunting expedition in British East Africa.

5 **Stanley Carr Boulter** was born in 1852 and educated at Cambridge. Called to the Bar he was at one time editor of *The Times* Law Reports. He first came into prominence in 1889, when, in association with many of the leaders in London financial and legal circles, he formed the Law Debenture Corporation (Limited), of which he was chairman for twenty nine years until his death.

6. **Sir Frederick William Borden, K.C.M.G.**, was born in Nova Scotia in 1847. His father was a medical man and the son adopted his father's profession, took his M.D. degree at Harvard, and began to practise in his native province in 1868. In 1901 he was appointed honorary-colonel of the Canadian Army Medical Corps. He first entered Dominion Parliament in 1874 as member for King's County, N.S. He represented the same constituency until 1911, except during 1883-86. At the General Election of 1911 he was defeated, and then retired from politics. He was a Liberal and was appointed Minister of Militia in the Laurier Cabinet in July, 1896, and held that office continuously until the fall of the Ministry in 1911. He was created a K.C.M.G. on the occasion of the King's Coronation in 1902.

7 **Sir William Paget Bowman**, the eldest son of Sir William Bowman, first baronet, a distinguished surgeon, was born in 1846, educated at Eton and University College, Oxford, and was called to the Bar in 1870. He was Registrar of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy and Treasurer of the Cholmondeley Charities. He succeeded his father in the title in 1892. In 1870 he married Emily Frances, daughter of Captain W. Swabey, R.H.A., and leaves two sons and two daughters.

8. **Sir William Magnay**, the son of the first baronet, died at the age of 61 years. He was a prolific writer of novels, of which he published twenty-five. He married, in 1879, Margaret, daughter of the late Mr. Matthew Soulsby. He is succeeded by his son, born in 1884.

— **James Edward O'Conor, C.I.E.**, died at the age of 70 years. He went to India during the Viceroyalty of Lord Mayo, and in 1873 was made Registrar of the newly formed Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, afterwards becoming

Assistant Secretary in charge of the statistical branch. In 1908 he was on special service for the Fowler Currency Commission.

8. Vice-Admiral Sir George Warrender, K.C.V.O., C.B., second son of the sixth baronet, was born in 1860. He entered the Navy as a cadet in 1873. As a midshipman he served in the *Boadicea* and landed with the Naval Brigade in the Zulu War and accompanied the Eshewe Relief Column. He was also present at the battle of Ginghlovo and received the Zulu medal and clasp. In the same year 1879 he became a sub-lieutenant and a lieutenant in 1880. He specialised in gunnery and attained a high reputation in that branch. He was promoted to Commander in 1893 and to Captain in 1898. In 1900 he took part in the operations against the Boxers, and for this he received the C.B. He commanded the East Indies Squadron as a Commodore in 1907 and afterwards as a Rear-Admiral on his promotion to that rank in July, 1908. Returning from that command in 1909, he was appointed in 1910 to the command of the Second Cruiser Squadron, which he held until 1912, when he was transferred to the command of the Second Battle Squadron. At the Coronation celebrations in Dublin in July, 1911, he commanded the naval contingent at the great review in Phoenix Park and was awarded the K.C.V.O. by King George. He became a Vice-Admiral in June, 1913. During the early months of the European War he served as Second-in-Command of the Grand Fleet under Admiral Sir John Jellicoe, with his flag in the *King George V*. He was unable to retain this arduous post, however, and was appointed Commander-in-Chief at Plymouth, which post he was obliged to relinquish a month before his death. Sir George Warrender succeeded to the title on the death of his father in 1901. He married, in 1894, Lady Maud Ashley, daughter of the eighth Earl of Shaftesbury. There were three children of the marriage, and the elder son, who succeeds to the title, was born in 1899.

— Lieutenant-General Willems, Chief of the Belgian General Staff, died suddenly. He represented Belgium at the Allied War Council which was held in December, 1915, and at the Paris Conference on military and economic problems in March, 1916. In April, 1916, General Joffre personally

presented him with the Cross of a Commander of the Legion of Honour.

9. Hon. Arthur George Brand, the third son of the first Viscount Hampden, was born in 1853 and educated at Rugby. He was at one time assistant clerk in the House of Commons, and represented the Wisbech Division as a Liberal, from 1891-95 and from 1900-06. He was Treasurer of the Royal Household in 1894-95.

— Rev. Sydney William Skeffington was 75 years of age. He was the Senior Fellow of University College, Oxford, having held his Fellowship since 1869. He was formerly an assistant master at Charterhouse.

10. William Frederick Cody, better known as "Buffalo Bill," was born in Scott County, Iowa, in 1846. His life of adventure started when he was quite a boy. In 1863 he joined the United States army. By this time he was known as a great scout, and later he was made Chief Scout of the Fifth Cavalry by General Sheridan. He will be best remembered as the organiser of the "Wild West Show," which visited Europe for the first time in 1887 and which continued until 1913.

— Sir William Gundry was president of the Enfield Liberal Association for twenty-one years, and was a member of the firm of Ashly, Morris (Limited), City Merchants. He received his knighthood in the December, 1916, honours list.

11. Colonel William Aitken, C.B., had a distinguished career as an officer during the Afghan War of 1878 and the two succeeding years and also in India. He was five times mentioned in dispatches, and received the C.B. for distinguished service with the Chitral Relief Force in 1895. He was 70 years of age.

— Alexandre Count Benckendorff, the son of Constantin Count Benckendorff and Louise Princess de Croy Dulmen, was born in 1849 and educated in France and Germany. He entered the Diplomatic Service in 1869. In 1886 he became First Secretary at Vienna, and from 1897 to 1903 he was Minister at Copenhagen. Since 1903 Count Benckendorff had been Russian Ambassador to the Court of St. James's and during his term of office, in 1907, the Anglo-Russian Agreement was signed between Great

Britain and Russia which settled the question of the respective spheres of influence of the two countries in Persia, and following on the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904, resulted in the Triple Entente. In Anglo-Russian trade relations also he took a great interest, and one of his last public acts was to preside, on November 29, 1916, at the inaugural luncheon of the newly formed Russo-British Chamber of Commerce, of which he was the honorary president. He married, in 1879, Sophie Countess Shouvaloff, and leaves one son and a daughter.

12. Brigadier-General Lord Binning, C.B., M.V.O. The elder son and heir of the Earl of Haddington, he was born in 1856 and educated at Eton and Trinity, Cambridge. Entering the Royal Horse Guards, he served with distinction in the Egyptian campaign of 1882, with the Sudan Expedition two years later, and in the Hazara campaign of 1888. In 1889 he was A.D.C. to the Viceroy of India and commanded the Royal Horse Guards from 1899-1903. He was afterwards Lieutenant-Colonel Commanding the Lothians and Border Horse Yeomanry. In May, 1916, he was appointed temporary Brigadier-General. Lord Binning married in 1892 the only child of Mr. W. S. Salting, by whom he had two sons and a daughter.

— **Hans von Bleichroder** was the elder and surviving son of Gerson von Bleichroder who had been the confidant of Bismarck. Hans von Bleichroder was head of the banking firm of S. Bleichroder & Co., and formerly British Vice-Consul in Berlin. This appointment had come to be regarded as a perquisite of the firm, but in 1909 Herr von Schwabach, who then held the post, was induced to resign it, and Mr. Harry Boyle became the first British-born Consular representative in Berlin.

— **Mme. de Greven Rop Casten-skjold** was the third daughter of Count Frijs of Frijsenborg, Denmark, and married the Danish Minister in 1910.

13. John Jessop Hardwick, A.R.W.S., was 85 years of age. He studied under the Royal Academician Redgrave, Heilbert, and Danby, as well as Rossetti and Ruskin. He first exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1860, and his water-colours of landscape and flowers were well known. He was

elected an Associate of the Royal Water-Colour Society in 1882.

14. Henry Whitehead Moss was born in 1841, educated at Shrewsbury, and in 1860 proceeded to St. John's College, Cambridge, with a scholarship. In 1862 he was elected Craven University scholar, and in 1864 became Fellow and Lecturer of his College. In 1866 Dr Kennedy resigned the head-mastership of Shrewsbury, and Moss at the age of 25 was chosen as his successor and held that position until his retirement in 1908, a period of forty-two years. In 1887 he was made Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral.

15. William Frend de Morgan was born in 1839, the eldest son of Augustus de Morgan, fourth Wrangler and distinguished mathematician. He was educated at University College School and in 1855 entered University College (Faculty of Arts). In 1859 he entered the Royal Academy as a student, but he never gained distinction as an artist. It was in 1869 that his attention was first called to lustre and pottery. He began by experimenting in lustre and recalled the process of the famous Gubbio of the fifteenth century, he thus attracted the attention of artists all over England and brought the process once more to fame. He then made "tile-pictures," and a set was done for the *Lwadra*, the Russian Imperial Yacht. This work attracted enormous attention, and in 1875 he was an acknowledged and welcome member of the famous Chelsea "aesthetic set," which included William Morris, Rossetti, Ford Madox Brown, and Burne-Jones. In 1882 his tile factory was moved near the William Morris factory where it remained until 1888, and then it moved once more, and this time it was to Wandsworth. The factory went on for several years, and as late as 1900 it was still possible to see the tiles being made. Mr de Morgan, however, had no business capacity, and the tiles were a commercial failure. At the age of 66 he appeared in an entirely new rôle—that of a writer of fiction, and "Joseph Vance" was published in 1903. In 1907 "Alice-for-short" appeared, "Somehow Good" in 1908, "It Never Can Happen Again," 1909, "An Affair of Dishonour," 1910, and in 1911 "A Likely Story." His novels met with a decided success, but were in no sense in the style of the modern novelist. They were thoroughly in the spirit of the Victorian novel with every small detail filled in and leaving

nothing to the reader's imagination. In 1888 he married Evelyn Pickering, daughter of Peiceval Pickering, Q.C., and from that time, owing to ill-health, he was compelled to winter in Florence, returning to England in the summer.

16. Admiral George Dewey, the most distinguished of living American naval officers, came of an old Pilgrim stock. He was born at Montpelier, Vermont, in 1837, appointed to the Naval Academy in 1854, and in 1858 was appointed as a midshipman to the *Wabash* on the Mediterranean Station. In 1861 he became a lieutenant. In the Civil War he saw much service of a varied and exciting kind. Until 1868 Dewey saw service in European waters, he was then appointed to the Naval Academy, afterwards receiving command of the *Narragansett* on special service. For the next twenty-five years or more he was actively engaged both ashore and afloat. Shortly before the war with Spain, Mr. Roosevelt, who was Assistant Secretary to the Navy, appointed Admiral Dewey in command of the Asiatic Squadron at Manila. He lay in the bay at Hong-Kong when war was declared. He is known throughout the world as the Victor of Manila Bay, and the man who gave the Philippines to the United States. On hauling down his flag in October, 1899, Rear-Admiral Dewey was promoted to be Admiral of the Navy, and for more than seventeen years he presided over the Naval General Board. One of his last public utterances was a study of the Jutland battle, for the periodical entitled *Sea Power*.

— **Joseph Robert Diggle** was born in 1849 and educated at Manchester Grammar School and Wadham College, Oxford. In 1879 he represented the Marylebone Division on the London School Board, on which he sat for eighteen years, being Chairman from 1885 to 1894.

— **Major Lord Gorell, D.S.O., R.F.A.**, was killed in action after one year and ten months' continuous service abroad. Henry Gorell Barnes was the elder son of the former President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, who was raised to the peerage as Baron Gorell in 1909. Born in 1882 he was educated at Winchester, Trinity College, Oxford and Harvard. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1906, and acted as secretary to his father when he was on the Bench and also to the Royal Commission on Divorce. He

succeeded to the title in 1913. Lord Gorell was unmarried and is succeeded by his brother.

16. Sir Pyers Charles Mostyn was the only son of the ninth baronet and succeeded to the title in 1912. He was 21 years of age. The title dates from 1670, and his cousin, Captain Pyers George Joseph Mostyn, succeeds.

17. The Rt. Rev. Anthony Mitchell was in his 49th year. After a brilliant scholastic career at Aberdeen University, Caius College, Cambridge, Edinburgh University, and the Episcopal Theological College, Dr. Mitchell was ordained in 1892. In 1903 he became canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, and Chancellor in 1912, the same year in which he became Bishop of Aberdeen. He was an ecclesiastical historian of considerable repute.

18. Mrs. John Billington was formerly a well-known actress and played with great success in all the big towns. She acted with Charles Mathews, Samuel Phelps, Madame Celeste, and Ben Webster. In 1857 she joined Webster's Company at the Adelphi, to which her husband, the actor John Billington, already belonged. Her later years were spent in teaching. She was 92 years of age.

— **Earl of Elgin.** Victor Alexander Bruce, ninth Earl of Elgin and 13th Earl of Kincardine, was born at Montreal in 1849, his father being then Governor-General of Canada. He was educated first at Glenalmond, afterwards at Eton, and then he went on to Balliol. He was a Liberal in politics and was for many years Chairman of the Scottish Liberal Association. When the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill divided the Liberal Party, he followed Mr. Gladstone. In the short-lived Government of 1886 he held the posts first of Treasurer of the Household and then of First Commissioner of Works. In 1893 he was offered the post of Viceroy and Governor-General of India, but he hesitated to accept it, but finally Lord Rosebery succeeded in persuading him to accept this great office, and he arrived in India in January, 1894. During his term of office he had many difficulties to overcome, the financial situation, war, famine, and in 1896 plague made its appearance in Bombay and spread with alarming rapidity. Lord Elgin and his Government met these difficulties with great resource.

and success, and on his return to England in 1899 he was made Knight of the Garter. When Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman formed his Ministry in December, 1905, Lord Elgin accepted the post of Colonial Secretary, and was confronted at once with the problem of Transvaal Constitution. The Constitution which he helped to frame was in 1910 merged in the larger whole of the Union of South Africa. On the death of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman in 1908, Mr. Asquith became Prime Minister and Lord Elgin was not included in the Cabinet. Lord Elgin declined the marquisate which was offered to him and took no further active part in politics. He took part in public matters, however, and helped to solve the difficult problems arising out of the ecclesiastical crisis in Scotland besides continuing in his educational work. In 1914 he became Lord Rector of Aberdeen University. Lord Elgin married in 1876 Lady Constance Carnegie, daughter of the ninth Earl of Southesk. There were eleven children of the marriage, and he is succeeded in the title by his eldest son, Major Lord Bruce, R.G.A (T.F.), who was born in 1881. His first wife died in 1909 and he married in 1913 Gertrude, widow of Captain Frederick Ogilvy, R.N.

19. Sir Leslie Edmund Percy Falkiner, the only son of the sixth baronet, was born in 1866, educated at Marlborough and in H.M.S. Worcester; he succeeded his father in 1898. He was twice married, and is succeeded by his eldest son Terence, who is 18 years of age.

20. Duke of Atholl, the only son of the sixth Duke, was educated at Eton and held a commission in the Scots Guards, from which he retired with the rank of Captain in 1866. He succeeded his father in 1864. The Duke was a member of the Order of the Thistle, of which he was latterly the *doyen*, becoming Chancellor of the Order in 1913. He was Hon. Colonel of a battalion of the Black Watch, was President of the Perthshire Territorial Force Association, and had been Loud Lieutenant of Perthshire since 1879. The share he took in public life was in the county life of Perthshire and the Highlands. He was Captain of the "Atholl Highlanders," the only private corps in Britain, which received its Colours from Queen Victoria for service rendered during Royal visits in the 'forties. The Duke married in 1863 the eldest daughter of Sir Thomas

Moncreiffe, seventh baronet. She died in 1902 leaving three sons and three daughters. He is succeeded by his eldest son, the Marquess of Tullochdale, who is 45 years of age.

24. Manuel Achille Baudouin, who was born at Tours in 1846, was one of the most distinguished members of the French Bench. In 1880 he was Advocate-General at Lyons, in 1885 Procurator-General at Limoges, and in 1890 he came to Paris as Advocate-General at the Court of Cassation. In 1893 he was appointed President of the Civil Tribunal in this Court, and later he figured as Procurator-General in the revision of the Dreyfus trial. M. Baudouin had been Chief President of the Court of Cassation since 1913. He was a Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour.

— **Lord Masham** was 59 years of age. He succeeded his father, the first baron, in 1906, and was educated at Harrow and St John's College, Oxford. He was prominent in the industrial life of Yorkshire. Lord Masham was unmarried and is succeeded in the title by his brother, the Hon. John Cunliffe Lister.

26. Sir Robert Bourchier Sheridan Wrey, eleventh baronet, was 61 years of age. He served in the Navy, retiring with the rank of captain, and afterwards was honorary lieutenant-colonel of the Royal North Devon Hussars. He served in the Egyptian Campaign of 1882 and with the naval brigade that was landed with the Army during the Burma Annexation War in 1885-87. Sir Bourchier Wrey who succeeded his father in the title in 1900, leaves one daughter born in 1911, and the heir-presumptive is his brother who was born in 1888.

27. Brigadier-General Walter Long, C.M.G., D.S.O., fell in action at the head of his Brigade. The elder son and heir of Mr. Walter Long, Secretary of State for the Colonies, he was born in 1879 and educated at Harrow. In 1899 he was gazetted to the Royal Scots Greys. He saw active service in the South African War, was mentioned in dispatches and gained the D.S.O. there, as well as the Queen's and King's medals, each with two clasps. After serving with his regiment for some years he went to India as additional A.D.C. to General Sir O'Moore Creagh. Afterwards he went to Canada as A.D.C. to the Duke of Connaught. He went to France

with his regiment at the outbreak of the European War, was mentioned in dispatches several times by Lord French and by Sir Douglas Haig, and was given a C M G. Recently he was given a brevet lieutenant-colonelcy. In 1910 he married Sibell, elder daughter of the present Lord Derwent, and leaves a son, born in 1911.

28. The Very Rev. William Barker, Dean of Carlisle, was born in 1838. He was educated at home until he proceeded to Worcester College, Oxford. In 1862 he was ordained by Dr Tait, Bishop of London, who licensed him to the curacy of Hanover Chapel, Regent Street. In 1876 he was nominated by Queen Victoria to be one of her Honorary Chaplains (Chaplain in Ordinary, 1880). He was an enthusiastic admirer of Mr. Gladstone, who in 1882 appointed him to the rectory of St Marylebone. In 1885 Mr. Gladstone followed this up by appointing Mr Barker to the prebend of Finsbury in St. Paul's Cathedral. His interest in education was keen, and he was elected to the London School Board in 1882 and served for two triennial periods. He also took enormous interest in Liberal politics and in temperance legislation. When the Liberal party came into power in 1906 Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman recommended him for the Deanery of Carlisle in 1908.

— **Lieutenant-General Sir John Fryer, K.C.B.**, the eldest son of the late Mr. John Fryer, was born in 1838. Educated at Exeter College, Oxford, he entered the Army in 1860 as a Cornet in the Carabiniers, and commanded in the regiment as lieutenant-colonel from 1877 to 1882, and his service in that position covered the campaign in Afghanistan of 1879-80. He held the Afghan medal and was made a C.B. in 1881 and K.C.B. in 1903.

29. Lord Cromer was born in 1841. His father was Mr. Henry Baring, M.P., a member of a great financial family. He began life as a soldier, having passed in 1858 at the age of 17 out of Woolwich into the Royal Artillery. As A.D.C. to Sir Henry Storks he went to the Ionian Islands in 1861, and in 1865 he acted as secretary to the Commission which was sent to Jamaica to inquire into the outbreak of the coloured population and the repressive measures adopted by Governor Eyre. In 1872 he became private secretary

to the Viceroy of India—Lord Northbrook, and during the period of four years which he spent in India he acquired great experience of public, especially of financial affairs. Soon after leaving India with Lord Northbrook in 1876, he went for the first time to Egypt. Lord Cromer has described in "Modern Egypt" the appalling picture which that country presented in 1877. Major Baring (as he then was) took up his first post in Cairo as Commissioner of the Debt in 1877. There was no authority to curb Ismail's masterful temper, and in 1878 "the nadir of financial chaos and popular misery" was reached, and in 1879 Ismail was compelled to abdicate. Shortly afterwards Major Baring was appointed, with M. de Blignières as his French colleague, Comptroller-General of Egyptian Finance. In 1880 Major Baring was invited to return to India as Financial Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. On his arrival he found himself face to face with a large deficit, but in less than four years he restored the financial equilibrium. Before the end of 1888 he was back in Egypt, this time as H.M. Agent and Consul-General, he found the Administration in a chaotic condition, bankruptcy in the Egyptian Exchequer was imminent, and Abdul Hamid had lost all semblance of authority by his uniehable methods. But by perseverance and judgment the first ten years of Sir Evelyn Baring's tenure of office changed the whole aspect of affairs. His first care was to secure an adequate supply and equitable distribution of water, and he used a loan, which Egypt was able to raise, to be devoted to irrigation works. His next reform was an equitable incidence of taxation and the creation of an honest and efficient administration. By 1889 he was able to announce that the fear of bankruptcy had been overcome, and from this time there was a steady progress of Egyptian prosperity until at last through his efforts the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904 relieved the Egyptian Treasury of financial restraints. It was in May, 1907, that Lord Cromer, owing to ill-health, resigned his position as Consul-General in Egypt after twenty-four years' service. On his return to London he took no prominent part in English political controversies, but he promoted non-party organisations to resist the Women's Suffrage movement and the ignorant clamour against the employment of vivisection in furtherance of surgical and medical science.

His unshakable faith in the principles of Free Trade were against any co-operation with the Unionist Party. Lord Cromer continued to fulfil many public duties, although his health of late years was uncertain. In July, 1916, he was appointed Chairman of the Commission of Inquiry on the Dardanelles Campaign, and he also took part in debates in Parliament and contributed to public discussion in the Press. Lord Cromer is succeeded by his eldest son, Lord Errington, who is married to a daughter of the late Lord Minto.

30. Admiral Sir Henry Coey Kane, K.C.B., who was the second son of the late Sir Robert Kane, died at the age of 73. He entered the Navy as a Cadet in 1858, was promoted Captain in 1882, Rear-Admiral in 1897, and Admiral in 1907. He saw active service in Egypt in 1882, and for his services in this campaign he received the Egyptian medal and the Khedive's bronze star. From 1883 to 1887 he served as Naval Attaché. In 1887 he was appointed to the command of H.M.S. *Calliope*, and it will be remembered that by great pluck and fine seamanship he was able to save that ship in the terrible hurricane of March 16 and 17 at Apia, Samoa. In 1894 Admiral Kane became Director of Naval Ordnance, an office which he held until his retirement in 1898. He was made C.B. in 1891 and K.C.B. in 1911.

31. Lisle March-Phillipps was 57 years of age. He was the son of Spencer March-Phillipps, Edinburgh Reviewer and writer on international law, and was himself a graceful writer, particularly on art and architecture.

— Sir Walter Peace, K.C.M.G., I.S.O., the son of a professor of music at Huddersfield, was 76 years of age. At the age of 23 he went to Natal. After acting as Consul for Belgium and Vice-Consul for Portugal he was appointed in 1880 Emigration and Harbour Agent for Natal in London. Thirteen years later his official title was altered to Agent-General and he received the C.M.G., the K.C.M.G. following a few years afterwards. In 1905 he retired

Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Das, C.I.E., the Bengali explorer, was 67 years of age when he died in January. He was 30 when he paid his first visit to Tibet. In 1885 he accompanied Mr Macaulay, Chief Secretary to the Bengal Government, to Peking, when permission was sought from the Chinese Government for a mission to enter Tibet, and for this service he was awarded the C.I.E. The Royal Geographical Society in 1888 awarded him the "Back" premium for his geographical researches

FEBRUARY.

1. Sir Thomas C. C. Western, third baronet, the only son of Sir Thomas Sutton Western, was born in 1850 and educated at Eton and Christ Church, and was formerly in the 2nd Life Guards. He was a J.P. and a D.L. for Essex. Sir Thomas Western succeeded to the baronetcy in 1877.

— **Michel Cazin** was the son of the great French artist, Jean Michel Cazin. He was 43 years old. He was a well-known landscape painter and etcher and was chosen by the French Government to make drawings and etchings for the official publication "L'Album de Guerre." He was engaged on this work when he met his death as the result of the explosion of a shell on board a French warship.

2. Colonel Thomas Holbein Hendley, C.I.E., was in his 70th year. He received his professional

education at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, where he was Gold Medallist, and entered the Indian Medical Service in 1869. He was an ardent Volunteer officer. Colonel Hendley was the author of a number of works on Indian Art and History.

2. Sir Thomas Henry Hepburn, born in 1840, was educated at London University, and engaged in the paper-making trade, first at St. Mary Cray, Kent, and later at Bradninch. He was a member of the Devon County Council for nearly thirty years. He was knighted in 1912.

4. The Right Hon. Francis John Savile Foljambe was the eldest son of Mr. George Savile Foljambe and was in his 87th year. Educated at Eton and Christ Church, he sat in the House of Commons for East Retford as a Liberal from 1857 to 1885. In

1856 he married Lady Gertrude Acheson, eldest daughter of the third Earl of Gosford, by whom he had three sons. Mr. Foljambe was long a successful breeder of Shorthorn cattle.

4 Major Sir Nicholas Gosselin was the second son of the late Major Nicholas Gosselin, of Co. Cavan, Ireland. Entering the Army at the age of 16, he served in the 39th and 23rd Regiments and subsequently became adjutant of the Cavan Militia. In 1882 he was appointed a resident magistrate, and after serving one year in the West of Ireland was given a special appointment at the Home Office. He was knighted on his retirement in 1905.

— **Mrs. Walter**, widow of John Walter who was for nearly fifty years the chief proprietor of *The Times*. She was the fourth daughter of James Munro Macnabb, born in 1836 and married John Walter as his second wife in 1861. One of the great interests of her life was the hospital, now known as the Florence Nightingale Hospital for Gentlewomen. Mrs. Walter joined the Committee in 1878 and was president from 1893 to 1906.

5 Earl of Harrington was born in 1814. He was best known as an enthusiastic sportsman. He was one of the pioneers of polo. For some years he was prominent as an amateur jockey, it was, however, as a hunting man that he was most widely known. In 1881 he became Master of the South Notts Hounds. As Lord Petesham in 1878 he was elected to the Royal Yacht Squadron. He formerly commanded the Cheshire Yeomanry and only retired after forty years' service. In 1869 he married the youngest daughter of the second Lord Carrington, but there are no children, and he is succeeded by his brother, the Hon. Dudley Henry Eden Stanhope, who was born in 1859.

— **Paul Rubens**, the dramatic author and composer, was born in 1875 and educated at Winchester and University College, Oxford. He originally intended to pursue a legal career, but he soon gave this up in favour of writing for the stage. The first song which he wrote professionally was in "The Shop Girl" at the Gaiety in 1895. Since then he was associated with many of the musical comedy successes produced on the London stage.

6. Robert Whitelaw was born in 1843. In 1861 he was elected to an open Classical Scholarship at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1864 he was a Craven Scholar. From 1866 to 1867 he was a Fellow of Trinity, and in 1866 he was appointed to a mastership at Rugby. In 1870 he succeeded Mr A. W. Potts as master of the "Twenty," and he held this position for more than forty-three years. After forty-seven years' work as a master, Mr. Whitelaw retired in the summer of 1913.

7. George Robertson Sinclair, Mus. Doc., was born in 1863, and after studying at the Royal Irish Academy of Music became assistant organist at Gloucester Cathedral, and then at the age of 17, organist and chorister of Truro Cathedral. Since 1889 he had been organist of Hereford Cathedral and conducted the Three Choirs Festivals there from 1891 onwards, introducing the *Parisifal* music into the festival.

— **Sir Joseph Weston-Stevens** was 56 years of age. He was Chairman of the Taff Vale Railway Company, a Director of Messrs. Guest, Keen & Nettlefolds (Limited), and the London City and Midland Bank (Limited), and Chairman of the Bristol Wagon and Carriage Works Company. He had been Sheriff of Bristol and President of the Bristol Liberal Federation, and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Western Counties Liberal Federation for seventeen years. He was knighted in 1913.

8. The Ven. Edward Scobell, the son of the Rev. S. G. Scobell, was in his 68th year. Educated at Marlborough and Pembroke College, Oxford, of which he was a scholar, he was ordained in 1873. In 1889 he became rector of Upton St. Leonards, and remained there until in 1912 he was appointed a residentiary canon in the cathedral. From 1903 he had been Archdeacon of Gloucester, and he retained this office with the canonry.

10. John William Waterhouse, R.A., was in his 68th year. The first of his paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy was "Sleep and his half-brother Death" in 1874, and since then there have been few Academies without one or two of his works. He was elected an Associate in 1885, the year of one of his best-known paintings, the "St. Eulalia." "The Magic Circle,"

painted in 1886, which was purchased for £500, for the Chantrey Bequest Collection, and "The Lady of Shalott," which was exhibited at the Academy in 1888, were others of his most popular works. He became an R.A. in 1895.

11. **Canon the Hon. Sidney Meade**, son of the third Earl of Clanwilliam, was in his 78th year. He was rector of Wylde, Wilts, for thirteen years, and was appointed a canon of Salisbury Cathedral in 1892.

— **Duke of Norfolk.** Sir Henry Fitzalan-Howard, K.G., G.C.V.O., P.C., Duke of Norfolk and Earl of Surrey (1483), Earl of Arundel (adjudged by possession of Arundel Castle, 1433), and Norfolk (1644), Baron Fitzalan, Clun, Oswaldestre, and Maltravers (1330), Earl Marshal (1483), Hereditary Marshal of England (1672), premier Duke and premier Earl of England, was born in 1847, the son of the 14th Duke. He succeeded his father in 1860 at the age of 13. In the same year he began his school life at Cardinal Newman's School, the Oratory. Cardinal Newman tried to carry on for Roman Catholics the traditions of our public schools. Roman Catholics in those days were not allowed to attend the Universities, a ban which the Duke, with other laymen, succeeded in getting removed for a later generation. At the age of 17 he was sent to travel, and he stayed for a long time with his uncle, Lord Lyons, who was then Ambassador at Constantinople, he owed much to Lord Lyons who had great formative influence with young men. As a very young man the Duke began the immense work for his co-religionists from which he never rested. Abroad the Duke of Norfolk came to be looked upon as the representative of Roman Catholicism in England. From 1895 to 1900 he was Postmaster-General in Lord Salisbury's Government. He resigned in 1900 in order to volunteer for active service in the South African War as an officer in the Imperial Yeomanry, and in 1901 he received an honorary commission as a Captain in the Army in recognition of his service in the field. He sat frequently on Royal Commissions and did much work in regard to educational questions. In 1905 he was made Lord Lieutenant of Sussex. He served as Mayor of Sheffield in 1895, being one of the first peers to occupy the position of a provincial Mayor, in 1897 it was raised to the dignity of a Lord Mayoralty, and the Duke of Norfolk became the first Lord Mayor

of Sheffield. In the founding of Sheffield University he took a leading part and was its first Chancellor. Throughout his life he was in close relation with the Vatican, and in 1887 he was sent as Her Majesty's special envoy with presents and congratulations from Queen Victoria to Pope Leo XIII. He was intensely interested in ceremonial and had great knowledge on the subject. He was a great lover of Gothic architecture and was a great builder, his first church was the one at Arundel, but as his taste developed an earlier and more severe style became his ideal and he preferred the Church at Norwich to anything else he had put up. There is much fine work in stained glass in all his buildings. In 1877 he married Lady Flora Hastings, daughter of the first Lord Donington; she died ten years later. By this marriage he had one son, who grew up almost blind and a complete invalid; but in 1902, to the intense grief of his father, the son died. Seventeen years after the death of his first wife he married the daughter of Lord Hennies, by her he had a son and three daughters. The son, Bernard Marmaduke, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, who succeeds to the dukedom, is 9 years old.

13. **Harry Ellis Wooldridge** was 72 years of age. He was esteemed both in England and abroad as an antiquarian musical expert of the first rank. As a young man he entered as a student at the Royal Academy, where he quickly distinguished himself. His first picture was bought by Sir Frederic Leighton, and a cabinet which he decorated was secured for South Kensington. At this time, too, he accepted many commissions for decorative and ecclesiastical work. During the whole of this time he was studying music, and he came to know, through exploring the treasure of Old Italian music, more about polyphonic music than any man living. The late Sir John Stainer invited him to assist him in his public lectures, but at this time he was elected by Oxford University to the Slade Professorship, a post which he occupied for some years, being twice re-elected. He became a member of Trinity College and received the degree of M.A. in 1895, the year of his first election to the chair. The University also enlisted him to write the first volume of their History of Music.

— **Madame Rodin**, the wife of M. Auguste Rodin, the French sculptor, was 72 years of age. For fifty-two

years she was the devoted companion of the artist, acting for a long time as his assistant and model.

18 Lieutenant-Colonel Dudley Sampson was in his 77th year. He joined the Indian Army in 1857, and he served with the 34th Border Regiment as ensign and lieutenant, afterwards becoming adjutant and squadron commander to the 9th Lancers. He saw much fighting during the Indian Mutiny. He was at the relief of Lucknow and afterwards took part in forced marches, under Sir Edward Lugard, which ended in the relief of Azimgurh.

17. Lady Borthwick was the daughter of Thomas Heimitage Day and was 83 years of age. She married in 1865 Cunningham Loid Borthwick, who died in 1885.

— **Lady Doverdale** was 77 years of age. She was the wife of Lord Doverdale, formerly Sir Edward Partington, who received a balcony in December, 1916. She leaves a son and three daughters.

— **Surgeon-General Sir Benjamin Franklin** was born in 1844 and educated at University College, London, and in Paris. He entered the Indian Medical Service, and after periods at Lucknow and Simla was surgeon to the Viceroy Lord Elgin from 1894 to 1899. He was honorary physician to Queen Victoria, King Edward, and King George, and was British delegate to the International Sanitary Conference at Rome in 1907 and at Paris in 1911-12. He was created K.C.I.E. in 1908.

— **The Dowager Lady Lamington** was in her 93rd year. She married in 1844 the first Lord Lamington, by whom she had a son, the present peer, and three daughters.

— **Hon. Mrs. George Mostyn** married in 1859 the late Hon. George Charles Mostyn, elder son of the sixth Lord Vaux, by whom she had four sons and three daughters.

— **Dr. Louisa Woodcock**, physician to the Endell Street Military Hospital, and assistant physician to the New Hospital for Women, was educated at the Ladies' College, Cheltenham, at Somerville College, Oxford, and at the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women, and held the degrees of M.D., B.S., Lond., and M.A., Trinity College, Dublin.

17 Dr. J. W. Smith, K.C., was born in 1830 and educated at Shrewsbury School and at Balliol College, Oxford, was called to the Bar as a member of the Inner Temple in 1853 and practised at the English Bar till 1875, when he went abroad. He practised at Pietermaritzburg as a solicitor and barrister. In 1878 Dr Smith went to Australia, and besides his practice he wrote leading articles in the principal newspapers and became an author of legal text-books. In 1907 he was made a King's Counsel of Western Australia, and retired from his profession in 1915.

18 Charles Emile Auguste Duran, better known as "Carolus Duran," was born at Lille in 1837, of parents in humble circumstances. At the age of 22 he went to Paris to study Art, but he only remained there a short time, for in 1860 he won a prize and went to study in Italy for several years. He returned to Paris in 1866 and at once began to succeed, and in the same year he exhibited "L'Assassiné," a picture now in the gallery at Lille. In the next year he went to Madrid and stayed there twelve months, studying Velasquez, and in five or six years (1870-76) Carolus Duran had made himself a great reputation as the painter of fashionable ladies' portraits, and will be remembered as one of the leaders of French art in the last days of the Second Empire and for the first thirty years of the Republic.

20. Thomas Wilberforce Stoughton, the senior partner in the firm of Messrs Hodder & Stoughton, was 75. It was first intended that he should enter the Diplomatic Service, and he studied for some years in Berlin, but in 1867 he became a partner with the late Mr M. H. Hodder. This firm gradually grew and strengthened until it took its place among the leading publishing houses in the country.

21. Dr. John Faithfull Fleet, C.I.E., was in his 70th year. Educated at Merchant Taylors' School and University College, London, Dr Fleet went to Bombay at the close of 1867 in the Indian Civil Service. He was employed on the Executive side, and served in the districts until early in 1883, when his special studies were recognised by his appointment as Epigraphist to the Government of India. In June, 1886, he reverted to the regular line of service and was Commissioner of the Central and Southern Divisions

of Bombay respectively till his retirement in 1897.

21. Dr. Horace Benge Dobell, M.D., was in his 90th year. At the time of his death Dr Dobell was the senior member of the Royal College of Physicians and honorary consulting physician to the Royal Hospital for Diseases of the Chest. His medical works include "Bacillary Consumption," "Diet and Regimen" (seventh edition, 1882), and "Medical Aspects of Bournemouth." He retired from practice in 1892.

24. The Venerable Robert Walsh, D.D., the eldest son of the late Right Hon. J. E. Walsh, formerly Master of the Rolls in Ireland, he was educated at Dublin University and ordained in 1865. In 1909 he became Archdeacon of Dublin.

25 Major-General Sir Cromer Ashburnham, K.C.B., was the fourth son of the Rev. Sir John Ashburnham, seventh Bart., of Broomham, Sussex, Chancellor and Prebendary of Chichester. He was born in 1831 and in 1855 obtained his commission in the 60th Rifles, serving with them in the Indian Mutiny campaign. In the Afghan war of 1878-80 he commanded, as a major, the 2nd Battalion of his regiment. In 1880 Sir Cromer was promoted to the command of the 3rd Battalion and with it served throughout the Boer War of that year. He was twice mentioned in dispatches, and received the C.B. In 1882 he was ordered to Egypt and there took part in Lord Wolseley's campaign against Arabi. He was twice mentioned in dispatches and received the K.C.B. and the Medjidie, and was also appointed Aide-de-Camp to Queen Victoria. In 1884 he was placed on half-pay but given employment on the staff, and in 1886 he retired with the rank of major-general, receiving in the same year a Distinguished Service reward. In 1907 he was appointed a colonel-commandant of his old regiment.

— General Sir Mowbray Thomson, K.C.I.E., was born in 1832. He went out to Calcutta for mercantile life when still a boy. In 1853 he joined the 53rd Bengal Infantry as a subaltern and the regiment was moved from Cuttack in the beginning of 1857 to Cawnpore. The story of the siege is graphically told in his "Story of

Cawnpore" published in 1859. He was badly wounded several times and was invalided home, given the medal with the clasp, made brevet-major, and accorded a year's seniority. On returning to duty, Thomson was given civilian employment as Political Agent at Manipur, and afterwards was Governor General's Agent for the ex-King of Oudh at Garden-reach, Calcutta. He was placed on the retired list in 1885, with the rank of major-general, and made full general in April, 1894.

26. Lord Ashcombe. George Cubitt was born in 1828, son of Mr. Thomas Cubitt, the famous English builder. He went to Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1860 he was elected M.P. for West Surrey, thus beginning a long and useful parliamentary career. He represented this constituency until 1885, when he was elected for the Mid or Epsom division of the county. In 1886 he was made a member of the Privy Council, and in 1892 was raised to the peerage. Lord Ashcombe married in 1853, and his only surviving son, the Hon. Henry Cubitt, succeeds to the barony.

— Rev. Edward Alexander Stuart was born in Calcutta in 1853. He was educated at Harrow and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he was a scholar of his college, and took a second class in the Classical Tripos in 1876. He was appointed a Prebendary in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1905, and two years later, on the nomination of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, he was made a Canon of Canterbury.

27 William Henry Hunter, M.Inst.C.E., was born in 1849 and educated at private schools and the College of Physical Science, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. After studying in the harbour and dockworks at Sunderland he became, in 1872, resident engineer on the Hylton and Monkwearmouth Railway, but in the following year he obtained an engagement which lasted nine years, on the reconstruction works of the River Weaver Navigation. Shortly afterwards his connexion with the Manchester Ship Canal began. He became chief assistant engineer on the design and construction of the canal in 1887. In 1895 he reached the position of chief engineer. This he held for fifteen years, and on his resignation he was appointed consulting engineer.

MARCH.

1. **Sir Benjamin Chapman Browne** was born in 1839 and served his time as an apprentice at Elswick and was afterwards engaged in harbour works at Tynemouth, Falmouth, and the Isle of Man. In 1870 he took over the locomotive works of Messrs R. & W. Hawthorn at Forth Banks. In 1886 there was an important development which consisted of the amalgamation of the firm with Messrs. Andrew Leslie & Co, the combined concern became known as Messrs. R & W. Hawthorn, Leslie & Co., and Sir Benjamin Browne remained its chairman until May, 1916, when he resigned, retaining, however, a seat on the board. He was Mayor of Newcastle-on-Tyne from 1885 to 1887 and received a knighthood in the latter year.

— **Sir Henry James Johnson** was born in 1851. He acted as solicitor in many of the most important shipping and insurance cases, and was President of the Law Society in 1910-11. He was knighted in 1911.

2. **Henry Cust** was the son of Major H. F. Cokayne Cust, born in 1862, and was heir to the barony of Brownlow. Educated at Eton he passed to Trinity, Cambridge, as a scholar about the year 1880. In 1890 he was elected M.P. for Stamford and held the seat until 1895. In 1900 he became Unionist member for Bermondsey (Southwark). His Parliamentary life ended with that Parliament. The editorship of the *Pall Mall Gazette* engaged much of his time, and journalistic work was in many respects more congenial to him. When the European War broke out Cust once more took up public life and became Chairman of the Central Committee for National Patriotic Organisations. He married in 1893 the daughter of Sir William Welby-Gregory.

— **M. Yovan Avakumovitch** was the former Chief of the Serbian Liberal Party, several times Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Serbia. After the outbreak of the European War, owing to his great age—he was 76—M. Avakumovitch did not leave Serbia at the time of the enemy invasion of 1915, but he was sent as a captive to Hungary, where he died.

5. **Dr. Manoel Jose d'Arriaga Brun da Silveira e Peyrelongue**, first President of the Portuguese Republic, was born in 1839 at Horta, in the Azores. He studied law at the University of Coimbra, taking his degree in 1866. While still at the University he professed strong sympathy with the Republican cause. In the Parliament of 1882-84 he was elected Deputy for Funchal as a Republican, and for Lisbon in that of 1890-92. He was elected President of the Portuguese Republic on August 24, 1911.

— **Major Sir Edward Gilbert Clayton, C.B.**, was the eldest son of the late Major-General Henry Clayton and was 75 years of age. He was educated at Brighton College and the East India Military College at Addiscombe, and joined the Royal Engineers at the end of 1859, retiring with the rank of major in 1880. He was for some time an Inspector of Prisons and Secretary to the Prison Commission. In 1905 he was made a C.B. and he was knighted in 1908.

— **Nawab Mustaq Husain, Vilkar-ul-Mulk Bahadur**, was in his 76th year. He was identified with the policy of educational enlightenment led by Sir Syed Ahmed, the eminent founder of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh. When Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk died in 1907, Nawab Mustaq Husain succeeded him as secretary of Aligarh College, and was regarded as the working leader of the Indian Moslems.

6. **Major Robert Mervyn Richardson** was born in 1857 and educated at the Edinburgh Academy, Loretto, and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. In 1880 he joined the 1st Battalion Seaforth Highlanders when they were in India, and served with them when they were in Egypt under Lord Wolseley. In 1890 he was transferred to the 14th (King's) Hussars, and served with them throughout the South African War, receiving the Queen's Medal with six clasps and the King's Medal with two clasps. Major Richardson retired from the Army in 1903 with the rank of major, but in 1906-8 he acted as major and lieutenant-colonel of the Middlesex Imperial Yeomanry.

7. **William Wordsworth**, the eldest surviving grandson of the poet,

was 80 years old. Mr. Wordsworth himself was a great scholar and a poet of high distinction. A volume of his sonnets was issued privately some years ago.

7. **G. W. Guthrie**, the United States Ambassador at Tokyo, was born in Pittsburgh in 1848, and was a member of the American Bar. He held the office of Mayor of Pittsburgh before being appointed Ambassador to Japan in 1913.

8. **Ferdinand Count Zeppelin** was born in 1838. Entering on a military career, he became an officer at the age of 20. Five years later he took part as a volunteer in the American Civil War on the Union side, and it was then that his taste for aeronautics originated, from his experience in going up at St Paul in a balloon. Returning to his own country, he took part in the war between Prussia and Austria in 1866, and again saw active service in the war against France in 1870. After the war he continued his military career until 1891, when he retired with the rank of general. From this time he devoted his energies to the practical study of aeronautics. He encountered many difficulties, but in 1900 he built an airship which succeeded in rising from the earth and remaining in the air for twenty minutes, but it was wrecked as it attempted to land. In October, 1906, he made two successful flights, covering 60 miles in two hours, and a year later he managed to attain a speed of 36 miles an hour. Since that time the construction of Zeppelin airships has steadily progressed. During the European War the purposes for which these airships were employed were not those that Count Zeppelin intended when he began his efforts to construct them, his aim was to make a dirigible balloon able to travel across land and water to observe the movements of hostile fleets and armies, to carry persons or dispatches from one fleet station or army to another, but not to take an active part in the operations of actual warfare.

9. **Rev. Octavius Pickard-Cambridge, F.R.S.**, was born in 1828. He was an authority on spiders and published "Specific Descriptions of Trapdoor Spiders" and "The Spiders of Dorset," and wrote the article on "Arachnida" in the ninth edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

10. **Sir George Chetwynd**, fourth baronet, was in his 66th year, and was

the second son of the third baronet by Lady Charlotte Augusta Hill, eldest daughter of the third Marquess of Downshire. He was educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford, and was well known for a great many years as an owner of racehorses. In 1870 he married Florence, Marchioness of Hastings, widow of the fourth Marquess of Hastings, and by her had three daughters and one son, who now succeeds to the title.

10. **Sir William Capel Slaughter** was a son of Mr. Mihill Slaughter, born in 1857. He was admitted a solicitor in 1879. After the outbreak of the European War he gave great assistance to Government Departments, especially the Board of Trade. His work on the Royal Commission on Sugar Supplies was recognised both by the Government and the trading community. He was awarded a knighthood in the Birthday Honours List of 1915.

11. **Sir William Adamson, C.M.G.**, was the son of Ebenezer Adamson of Glasgow. He was in his 85th year. He had resided in Singapore for many years, and had on several occasions been a member of the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements and was decorated for public services in connexion with the Colony. He was made a C.M.G. in 1897 and was knighted in 1907. He had been for more than twenty-four years a director of the P & O. Company.

— **Sir Charles Holcroft** was born at Bilston in 1831, and was well known for over half a century as a successful ironmaster and colliery owner. In 1856 he with his brothers and one or two others were associated in laying down the plant and sinking the first pits of the Conduit Colliery Company, and thus became one of the pioneers in the development of the Cannock Chase Coalfield. His chief relaxation was the study of geology. In 1905 he was given a baronetcy and in 1910 the University of Birmingham conferred upon him the honorary degree of LL.D.

— **Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Alfred Swaine Lethbridge** was 72 years of age and came of a well-known Devonshire family. Born in Tihoot, Bengal, he was educated at King's College, London, and at Aberdeen, where he received his M.D. degree. He joined the Bengal Army in 1867 and was for twenty years Inspector-General of Gaols in Bengal. In 1890 he was Chairman of the Factory Com-

mission and was transferred to the political department in 1892, becoming superintendent of the operations for the suppression of Thuggee and Dacoity—a position which he held until his retirement in 1898.

12. Sir Patrick Coll, K.C.B., was born in Limerick in 1830. He came to Dublin when a young man, and after serving his articles began practice in Dublin. In 1888, during the Lord Chancellorship of Sir Edward Sullivan, he was appointed Chief Crown Solicitor for Ireland. In 1896 he was knighted and in 1903 he was created a K.C.B. In 1905 he retired from his office and was appointed a member of the Irish Privy Council.

—Sir George Fardell was the son of the late Canon Henry Fardell of Ely, and was born in 1833. Educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford, he was called to the Bar in 1862, and later was appointed Registrar in Bankruptcy in Manchester, a post which he held until it was abolished. In 1895 he succeeded Lord Randolph Churchill as member of Parliament for South Paddington, retiring in January, 1910. He was a magistrate for the Isle of Ely and late Chairman of Quarter Sessions.

14. Duchess of Connaught. Her Royal Highness Princess Louise Margaret Alexandra Victoria Agnes of Prussia, the third daughter of Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia, was born on July 25, 1860, and on March 13, 1879, she married at Windsor his Royal Highness Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught, third son of Queen Victoria. In 1886 the Duchess accompanied her husband when he went to Bombay as Commander-in-Chief, and was throughout the duration of his command as popular as her husband and led society in Bombay and among the hills with much success. It was the same when in 1904 the Duke went out to Malta to hold the newly-established post of Inspector-General of the Forces, responsible to the Army Council, and also at Aldershot (1893-98) and most conspicuously so in Dublin (1900-1), and last of all in Canada. It was in June, 1912, that the Duchess, who was then at Ottawa, had her first attack of serious illness, and she was obliged to return to England to undergo an operation. In October, 1913, she was able to return with her husband to Canada, where she took up once more, with all her former success, the exacting duties of her post. In September,

1916, she and her husband said farewell to Canada amid universal tributes to their great qualities and unfailing success. Her three children were Princess Margaret Victoria (born 1882), Prince Arthur Frederick Patrick Albert (born 1883), and Princess Victoria Patricia (born 1886).

14. Maître Fernand Labori was born in 1860. He was counsel for the defence in nearly all the political trials during his period at the Bar. It was the Dreyfus case that brought him his great reputation. He fought for Dreyfus with unrelaxing energy, both during the first and second revisions of the case in 1898 and 1899. At Rennes he was shot at and wounded while he was on his way to Court, but he maintained his efforts until the final rehabilitation of Dreyfus in 1906. Maître Labori's last sensational case was that in which he defended Madame Caillaux and obtained her acquittal on a charge of shooting M. Gaston Calmette, the editor of the *Figaro*. His reputation as an advocate and lawyer carried him to the top of his profession, and he was elected Bâtonnier with an unprecedented number of votes. In both England and America Maître Labori was received as a representative of the best French traditions of justice.

16. Countess Brownlow, Lady Adelaide Talbot, youngest daughter of the eighteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, was born in 1844, and married in 1868, the third Earl Brownlow, Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire. There is no issue of the marriage.

20. Earl of Lindsay was in his 85th year. He succeeded his cousin as eleventh earl in 1894. The peerage is one of the oldest and most romantic in Scotland. He married in 1866 Emily Marian, daughter of Robert Crosse, of Doctors' Commons, and widow of Captain Edmund Charles Barnes. He is succeeded by his elder son, Viscount Garnock.

29. Colonel Sir Thomas Horatio Marshall, C.B., was 84 years of age, and was formerly actively associated with the Volunteer movement in Cheshire.

30. Lord Muncaster, Josslyn Francis Pennington, fifth Baron Muncaster of Ireland and the first of the United Kingdom, was born on Christmas Day, 1834. He was educated at Eton, and obtained a commission in the 90th Light Infantry, with which he

served in the Crimea for nearly two years, and received the Crimean Medal with clasp. He afterwards exchanged into the Rifle Brigade, and left the Army with the rank of captain shortly before succeeding his brother in the title in 1862. He was created a Baron of the United Kingdom in June, 1898. As an Irish peer he had not been disqualified from sitting in Parliament, and he represented West Cumberland as a Conservative from 1872 to 1880, and the Egremont Division of Cumberland from 1885 to 1892. He married in 1863 Constance Ann, second daughter of Mr. Edmund L'Estrange of Tynte, Co. Sligo. There

were no children and there is no heir to the barony.

31. **Sir Alexander Sharp-Bethune, Bt.**, born in 1860, was the grandson of General Bethune, and succeeded to the estates in 1900. He established his claim to the baronetcy only in December, 1916, before the Baronetage Committee of the Privy Council. Sir Alexander, who was formerly a tea-planter in Ceylon and was a prominent member of the Rubber Growers' Association, married in 1889, and is succeeded by his son, Alexander Maitland, who was born in 1909.

APRIL.

1. **Rev. A. B. Boyd-Carpenter**, who was 75 years of age, was educated at St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, and ordained in 1869. He served as Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Queen Victoria and as Hon. Chaplain to King Edward and King George. He was vicar of St. James's, Hull, from 1874 to 1887, and afterwards for fourteen years rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury. He was Golden Lecturer in 1895.

— **Lieutenant-Colonel James Halifax Western, C.M.G.**, joined the Royal Engineers in 1860, but spent most of his career in the service of the India Public Works Department. In 1863 he became Assistant Engineer for the North-West Provinces, and Executive Engineer in 1868. In 1884 he was appointed Officiating Chief Engineer and Joint Secretary for Irrigation for the Punjab, and afterwards Director-General of Works. In 1890 he went to Egypt as Engineering Inspector for that country and held the position for ten years. He retired from the Army with the honorary rank of lieutenant-colonel in 1887.

2. **Hon. Frederic William Anson**, fourth son of the Earl of Lichfield, was 55 years of age. Mr. Anson was manager of the West-End Branch of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), a director of the London and South-Western Bank, Chairman of the Piccadilly Hotel (Ltd.), and was a magistrate for Hertfordshire. He was twice married, first in 1888 to the daughter of the late Lieutenant-Colonel John Henry Bagot Lane, who died in 1908, leaving three sons and three daughters, and secondly in 1915 to the daughter of Mr. S. E. Rowland.

3. **Rev. John Gwynn, D.D.**, was the son of the Rev. Stephen Gwynn, an Irish clergyman, and was born at Larne in 1827. Educated at the Royal School, Enniskillen, he proceeded to Trinity College, Dublin, where he was elected a scholar in 1848, and there he laid the foundation of that classical learning which was so much esteemed by his colleagues in later years. He was ordained and acted as assistant Lecturer in the Divinity School and also as assistant to the Regius Professor of Greek. In 1873 Gwynn was appointed Dean of Raphoe, and in 1882 he moved from Ramelton to Derry as rector of the Cathedral parish, and exchanged the Deanery of Raphoe for that of Derry. A year afterwards he returned to academic life as Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity at Trinity College. In 1888 on Dr. Salmon's appointment to the Provostship, he was advanced to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, an office which he held until his death. His writings, chiefly on the Syriac versions of the New Testament, were masterpieces of scholarship and learning.

4. **Lord Allerton**, William Lawies Jackson, first Baron Allerton of Chapel Allerton, Leeds, was born in 1840. Trained privately at a Moravian School and practically self-educated he was essentially a self-made man. Early in his commercial career he devoted his energies to tanning, and was prominent in the leather industry. In 1869 he was elected to the Municipal Chamber of Leeds as a representative of the Headingley Ward. In 1895, though then a member of Parliament, he was nominated and elected as the first Conservative Mayor of Leeds.

In 1885 the city of Leeds was rearranged into five divisions, and Mr. Jackson was elected for the Northern Division, which he represented until 1902, when he was raised to the peerage. He was Financial Secretary to the Treasury in 1885-86 and again from 1886 to 1891, and Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1891-92. He had been Chairman of the Great Northern Railway Company for over twenty years, and was Chairman of the Royal Commission on Coal Resources, and Chairman of the South African Committee in 1896. Lord Allerton married, in 1860, Grace, daughter of Mr. George Tempest, by whom he had two sons and five daughters.

4. **R. Murray Gilchrist**, the novelist, was in his 50th year. Born and educated at Sheffield, he began to write at an early age. His first book, "Passion the Plaything," was published in 1890, his last, "Honeysuckle Rogue," was published late in 1916.

5. **Dowager Countess of Albemarle** was a daughter of Sir Allan McNab, Prime Minister of Canada, and married in 1855 the seventh Earl of Albemarle, who died in 1894. There were three sons and seven daughters of the marriage.

6. **Sir Robert Aikman** was born in 1844, educated at St. Andrews and Edinburgh Universities, and entered the India Civil Service in 1867. He was for fifteen years Puisne Judge of the High Court of the North-Western Provinces, and for three years was Chancellor of the Allahabad University. He retired from the service in 1909 and was knighted in the following year.

— **Horace Short** was 44 years of age and was one of the pioneers of British flying. He was an engineer of great ability and in 1913 invented the big seaplane with folding wings, which made it possible to carry seaplanes of large size on small ships. This invention proved invaluable during the European War.

7. **Lady Zouche of Haryngworth** was born in 1860, the only daughter of the fourteenth Baron Zouche, and in 1914 succeeded her brother, who died childless, as sixteenth in line. Lady Zouche was unmarried, and the title passes to her cousin, Lady Frankland.

— **Sir John Roberts** was in his 57th year. He was Mayor of Carnar-

von in 1911 and was knighted on the occasion of the investiture of the Prince of Wales.

8. **Mrs. Crowe**, the actress, whose stage name was Miss Kate Bateman, was born at Baltimore in 1843. She appeared on the stage at a very early age; but her greatest successes were in 1868 when she appeared at the Haymarket as Leah and in 1872 when she gave a superb performance of Medea in Mr. W. G. Will's adaptation of Legouvé's tragedy. From 1877 she was seldom seen on the stage.

— **Captain the Hon. James Terence Fitzmaurice, R.N.**, who was the fifth son of the fifth Earl of Orkney, was born in 1835, and served for twenty-seven years in the Navy. From 1867 to 1870 he held the appointment of Inspector-General of Prisons in Ceylon. Captain Fitzmaurice was a magistrate for Berkshire.

9. **Major Charles James Keene, C.I.E., V.D.**, was born in 1850. From 1874 to 1905 he served in the India Public Works Department and was during the last five years of his service traffic superintendent of the North-Western Railway of India. He left India in 1912, but on the outbreak of the European War he offered his services to the War Office. He was made a C.I.E. in 1903.

— **The Rev. Professor James Hope Moulton** was born in 1863 and educated at the Leys School and at King's College, Cambridge. In 1888 he became a Fellow of his College. Dr. Moulton obtained the Gold Medal in Classics at London University, of which he was a D.Litt. He was also an Hon. D.D. of Edinburgh, Hon. D.C.L. of Durham, and Hon. D.Theol. of Berlin and Groningen. At the time of his death he was Greenwood Professor of Hellenistic Greek and Indo-European Philology in Victoria University, Manchester, and Tutor at the Wesleyan College. Dr. Moulton entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1886 and published a number of theological works and articles. He was homeward bound from a missionary tour in India, when his ship was sunk and he died from exposure.

— **James Welch**, the actor, was the son of a Chartered Accountant of Liverpool. He came to London in the eighteen-eighties and became a member of Wilson Barrett's Company. He was one of those who took part in the

earliest performances of Mr. Bernard Shaw's plays, and he was among the early Ibsenites also. Later, he devoted himself almost entirely to farce, and in "When Knights were Bold" achieved enormous success.

10. **William John Courthope, C.B.**, was in his 75th year. He was educated at Harrow and New College, Oxford. He won the Newdigate prize in 1864, and the Chancellor's prize for English Essay in 1868. In 1870 he became an examiner in the Education Department, in 1887 a Civil Service Commissioner, and in 1892 Chief Commissioner, from which position he retired in 1907. He had received the honour of C.B. in 1895. In the same year he was elected Professor of Poetry at Oxford, an appointment which he ceased to hold in 1901. In 1909 he completed his monumental work in six volumes, the "History of English Poetry." Mr Courthope had been a member of the British Academy since 1900, and was Warton Lecturer on Poetry in 1911, and he was a member and a former Vice-President of the Academical Committee of the Royal Society of Literature.

— **Major Henry Macaulay, C.E.**, was 88 years of age. He was thirty years borough surveyor of Kingston, and was one of the pioneers of the Volunteer movement, with which he was associated from its inception in 1859. He was the winner of the prize of 250*l.* offered by the Peabody Trustees for the best design for their model dwellings and carried out many public works.

— **Major-General Stuart James Nicholson, C.B.**, was born in 1836 and educated at Charterhouse and the Royal Military Academy. He received his first commission in 1855 and became major-general in 1895. He served in the Sudan Expedition of 1885. During his service in the Army Major-General Nicholson held many different appointments. He was appointed Colonel-Commandant Royal Artillery in 1906, and was created a C.B. in 1897.

— **Surgeon-General Sir William Taylor** was born in 1843. Educated at Glasgow University, he joined the Army Medical Staff in 1864 and served in Canada, 1865-69. From 1870-80 he was in India, where he again served from 1882 till 1898. During the Chino-Japanese War Sir William Taylor acted as Military-Medical Attaché to the Japanese Army. From 1898 to 1901 he was principal

medical officer in India. In the latter year he was appointed Director General of the Army Medical Service, which post he held till 1904. He was created C.B. in 1898 and K.C.B. in 1902. He was a Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in England and an hon. LL.D. of Glasgow University.

11. **Robert Alexander Gillespie** was born in 1848. Educated at Weybridge School and St. John's College, Cambridge, he was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple in 1871, and between 1887 and 1901 acted as deputy magistrate at West Ham, in 1901 he was appointed as the Stipendiary for West Ham.

14. **Dr. Ludwig Zamenhof**, the inventor of Esperanto, died at Warsaw.

18. **Engineer Vice-Admiral Sir Albert John Durston, K.C.B., R.N.**, was born in 1846 and educated privately, in Portsmouth Dockyard, and at the Royal School of Naval Architecture, South Kensington, of which he was a Fellow. He entered the Royal Navy in 1866, became Chief Engineer in 1877, Chief Inspector of Machinery in 1893, and Chief Engineer at Sheerness and Portsmouth in 1881. He became Engineer-in-Chief of the Fleet in 1888 and retired in 1907. In 1897 he received a knighthood.

— **Sir William Houldsworth, Bt.**, was 88 years of age. He was a Justice of the Peace and Deputy-Lieutenant for Ayrshire, and held public offices in Lancashire. For twenty-three years — 1883-1906 — he represented North-West Manchester in Parliament. Sir William, who was made a baronet in 1887, is succeeded by his son, Henry Hamilton Houldsworth.

19. **Baron von Bissing** was 73 years of age. He had in his time taken part in the wars of 1866 and 1870, when he was attached to the Staff of the late Emperor Frederick, been aide-de-camp to the Emperor William and commanded the regiment of Gardes du Corps. In 1914 he was called from retirement and given command at the dépôt of his old Army Corps at Munster. At the end of November, 1914, he became second German Governor-General of Belgium and held that post until his death.

— **Miss Georgina Hogarth** was born in 1826. She was sister-in-law of Charles Dickens, and in 1848 became part of his household and "remained

a member until his death, and he had just reason to be proud of the steadiness, depth, and devotion of her friendship."

20. **Sir John Howard, A.I.C.E.** (1867), F.R.G.S., was in his 87th year. He had a long and distinguished career as a constructor of waterworks and railways throughout the country. He was a director of the North British Railway Company and also of the South-Western Suburban Water Company. Sir John, who had resided for many years at Preston Park, Brighton, completed the building of the Brighton Palace Pier at his own expense

21. **Sir Francis Cowley Burnand** was born in 1836 and educated at Eton (he was obliged to leave prematurely owing to illness) and Trinity College, Cambridge. At Trinity he achieved fame by founding the Amateur Dramatic Club, the first of the dramatic clubs at either university. At first Burnand was intended for the Bar, but afterwards it was suggested that he should take Orders, and on leaving Cambridge in 1858 he went to Cuddesdon. Later he became a Roman Catholic and went to live with the Oblates at St Mary of the Angels, Bayswater. Later he discovered that he had no vocation for the priesthood and he again began to read for the Bar. It was about this time that Burnand made the acquaintance of George Meredith who did him the service of getting one of his stories published in the magazine *Once a Week*, and thus he was introduced indirectly to Maik Lemon and *Punch*. He again turned his attention to dramatic authorship, and commissions for plays began to pour in so fast that practice at the Bar was out of the question. In the course of his life Burnand wrote at least 120 pieces. In 1863 the success of his "Mokeanna or the White Witness," which was the first example of the literary burlesque which may come to be regarded as Burnand's best work, was rewarded with a place on the staff of *Punch*. During Tom Taylor's last illness Burnand acted as Editor, and succeeded to the chair in 1880. Under his rule the paper grew in size and in

importance, and he held the Editorship until 1906. In 1902 he was knighted.

21. **Harry Paulton**, the actor and playwright, was born in 1842. His greatest success both as actor and playwright was in "Niobe," a very popular farce which he wrote in collaboration with his son

25. **William Henry James Weale**, the art-historian and antiquary, was born in 1832 and educated at King's College, London. At the age of 19 he had visited every parish in Belgium, and from the first he was a student of archaeology and art. In about 1860 he settled in Bruges in order the better to prosecute those studies in the medieval arts and crafts of the Netherlands which were to make him the greatest authority on the subject. In 1872 he was entrusted by the South Kensington Museum with the classification and description of its Netherlands art-objects, and in 1890 was appointed Keeper of the National Art Library

30. **John Arthur James** was born in 1853. He was well known in the hunting field and on the Turf, but his interests were not only confined to sport. He was a Justice of the Peace and a Deputy-Lieutenant for Warwickshire, and he served in the office of High Sheriff for the county in 1916. His charitable gifts were very large and discerning. Mr. James was an intimate friend of King Edward who created him M.V.O. in 1909. He was a Knight of Grace of St. John of Jerusalem, and married in 1885 Mary Venetia, daughter of the late Mr. George Cavendish Bentinck, M.P.

— **Dr. Henry Benjamin Wheatley**, F.S.A., was well known as a Pepysian. He was in his 79th year and had been clerk to the Royal Society from 1861 to 1879 and assistant secretary to the Society of Arts from 1879 to 1908. He wrote many books on the antiquarian side of literature, but his chief work was his new edition of "Pepys's Diary," which he printed practically *in extenso* for the first time.

MAY.

2. **Judge Martelli.** — Ernest Wynne Martelli was the youngest son of the late Mr. C. H. A. Martelli, barrister-at-law of Lincoln's Inn

Educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, he was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1888. He took silk in 1908. In July, 1916, he left Lincoln's

Inn for the Hampshire County Court, where he was appointed successor to the late Judge Gye

2 Dr. John Edward Squire, C.B., was born in 1855 and educated at University College, to the hospital of which, in 1882, he was appointed house physician. In 1885 he was appointed senior medical officer to the Red Cross Society, Suakin Field Force, and received the medal and clasp and the Khedive's bronze star. He was a Knight of Grace of the Order of St John of Jerusalem and was made a C.B. in 1904. His publications included "Essays on Consumption" and "Medical Hints for Medical Officers with Troops."

4. The Right Rev. William Lennox Mills, D.D., Bishop of Ontario, was in his 72nd year. Dr. Mills was ordained deacon in 1872 and priest in the following year, and was appointed incumbent of Trinity Church, Norwich, Ontario, shortly after his ordination. In 1884 he was made a Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal. In 1900 he was consecrated Bishop-Coadjutor of Ontario, with the title of Bishop of Kingston, becoming Bishop of Ontario in the following year.

— George Paul Taylor, the Metropolitan Magistrate, was 57 years of age. Educated at Downside College and at the Catholic University College, Kensington, he was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple in 1885, and was appointed a Metropolitan Magistrate in 1895.

— Colonel Rice was born in 1831. He was one of the few remaining Crimean veterans. Gazetted in 1848, he saw service in the Crimean Campaign as a captain in the Highland Brigade under Sir Colin Campbell, also as Staff Officer to the Brigade in the Indian Mutiny, in which he was promoted major for distinguished service in the field. After commanding the 72nd Highlanders at home for two years he retired, in 1870, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

— The Venerable Frederick Augustus Brymer, Archdeacon of Wells and rector of Charlton Mackrell, was 67 years old. Educated at Radley and Christ Church, Oxford, he afterwards became a student in Wells Theological College and was ordained in 1874. He was an assistant diocesan inspector of schools for a number of

years, and from 1887 to 1902 acted as honorary secretary to the Bath and Wells Diocesan Society. He was appointed Archdeacon of Wells in 1890 and was Proctor in Convocation of Bath and Wells in 1898.

8 Sir John McDougall was 73 years of age. He was ex-Chairman of the London County Council and a member of the Port of London Authority. In 1902 he received a knighthood.

10 Arthur Divett Hayter, first Lord Haversham, the only son of Sir William Goodenough Hayter, Bt., was born in 1835. He was educated at Eton and Brasenose, Oxford. At Eton he played for three years in the cricket XI. After serving for ten years in the Grenadier Guards, at the age of 30 he entered the House of Commons as Liberal member for Wells, and continued a member with some short intervals until he was raised to the peerage in 1906. He first held a ministerial office in 1880, when he became a Lord of the Treasury, and two years later he was appointed Financial Secretary at the War Office, remaining in office until the defeat of the Government in 1885. He was sworn a Privy Councillor in 1894. When Lord Haldane's Territorial Army came into existence he was chosen Chairman of the Berkshire Association. Lord Haversham married in 1866 Henriette, younger daughter of Mr. Adrian J. Hope. He leaves no heir.

— Dr. Henry Barclay Swete, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was born in 1835. He matriculated at Cambridge in 1854, being entered as a pensioner at Gonville and Caius College. Ordained priest in 1859 he was afterwards curate of All Saints, Cambridge, from 1866 to 1868, and of Tormohun, Torquay, 1869-72. He was Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans from 1881 until February 1890. In 1882 he was elected to the chair of Pastoral Theology at King's College, London, which he vacated on succeeding Dr. Westcott in the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge. He resigned this post in 1915, after occupying it for twenty-five years. In 1911 the King appointed him one of his hon. chaplains. Since 1883 he had been engaged on a monumental work, and in 1887 "The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint" issued from the Cambridge press; a separate issue of the Psalms followed in 1890, the second part in

1891 ; and the third and concluding part in 1894. This has passed into a third edition, and has been completed by an Introduction which makes the work invaluable, and is a masterpiece of sound scholarship. Besides many other works Dr. Swete also edited the "Cambridge Theological Essays," 1905, and the "Cambridge Biblical Essays," 1909.

11. Sir Robert James Stuart Graham, tenth baronet, of Esk was born in 1845 and succeeded to the title on the death of his father in 1864. He married in 1874, and is succeeded by his son, Montrose Stuart Graham, who lives in New York.

— **General Sir Samuel James Graham, K.C.B.**, was born in 1837 at Malta. He was the eldest son of Colonel J. J. Graham, 70th and 75th Regiments. He received his first commission in the Royal Marines in about 1856 and became Colonel-Commandant in May, 1886, and General in 1900, being placed on the retired list early in 1902. He served in the Baltic Campaign of 1854-55 and during the expedition to Egypt in 1882 and took part in many actions. In the course of these operations he was three times mentioned in dispatches and afterwards was made a C.B. Later he was among those selected to receive the Egyptian War Medal at the hands of Queen Victoria, and on his retirement in 1902 he was created a K.C.B. Sir James was twice married.

— **Sir Arthur Lasenby Liberty**, the founder and chairman of Liberty & Co. (Limited), was the eldest son of the late Mr. Arthur Liberty, a lace manufacturer of Nottingham, and was born in 1843. Educated at the University School, Nottingham, in 1862 he became manager of the Oriental Warehouse, formerly in Regent Street, where he became permanently acquainted with the leaders of the art world of the day. In 1875 he began business on his own account, his aim was to apply the Eastern art *motifs* to Western work, and gradually the finest textiles of the East were even surpassed. One of his most notable achievements was the introduction of dyes supposed to be a secret of the East, and this led to the popular appreciation of the range of delicate tints now known as the "Liberty Colours." In 1913 he received the honour of knighthood in recognition of his services to the applied and decorative arts. Besides his business activities Sir Arthur

was a magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for Bucks, and High Sheriff for the county in 1899, he was a juror at the Paris International Exhibition in 1900, a member of the London Committee of the Milan Exhibition in 1906, a member of the Royal Institute, a Fellow of the Asiatic Society and of the Organising Council of the Japan Society, and Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Royal School of Art Needlework.

12. Lord Clonbrock was 83 years old. He had been Lieutenant of Co. Galway since 1892, and was elected a representative peer for Ireland in 1895. Lord Clonbrock succeeded to the title on the death of his father, the third baron, in 1893. In 1856 he was an Attaché at Berlin and was afterwards Second Secretary at Vienna, and was twice private secretary to the Duke of Abercorn when he was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He married, in 1866, a daughter of the second Lord Crofton, and is succeeded by his son, the Hon. Robert Edward Dillon, born in 1869.

13. Rear-Admiral Sir Lambton Loraine, eleventh baronet, was in his 79th year, and succeeded to the title on the death of his father in 1852. The same year he entered the Navy, and served as sub-lieutenant on Queen Victoria's yacht. In 1858 he was raised to the rank of lieutenant, in 1867 he was made commander and in 1874 captain. In 1878 he was given the Freedom of the City of New York for services rendered to the United States. Sir Lambton was the first Chairman of the Standing Council of the Balonetage. He married, in 1878, a daughter of Captain Charles Acton Broke, R.E., and is succeeded by his second son, Percy Lyham Loraine, born in 1880.

15. Joseph H. Choate, the American statesman, was born in Salem 85 years ago. He graduated from the Harvard Law School in 1854 and afterwards went to New York. It was not long before he became a partner with W. M. Evarts, a lawyer of the first standing in New York, and he definitely settled on the law as his business in life, and finally rose to be its acknowledged leader. Mr. Choate was Ambassador in London from 1899 to 1905, and he reckoned those six years among the happiest and most successful of his life, and he was much gratified by his election to the Bench of the Middle Temple. When the great European War broke out he was pro-Ally, his sympathies were instinc-

tively on the British side, and his was one of the most potent of the contributory influences that ended in America joining the war in April, 1917

15 **General Putnik**, formerly Commander-in-Chief of the Serbian Armies, was about 70 years of age. Educated in Petrograd and at St Cyr, he returned to his native land to organise the Serbian Army, and served with the Russians against the Turks in 1876 and through the Balkan Wars. Throughout the Serbian campaign of 1914 and 1915 General Putnik was the Serbian Chief of Staff.

— **The Rajah of Sarawak.** Sir Charles Johnson Brooke, G.C.M.G., the second English Rajah of Sarawak, was born in 1829 in Somerset, and educated at Crewkerne Grammar School until in his 18th year he entered the Royal Navy as a volunteer of the first class. In 1844 he paid his first visit to Sarawak as a midshipman, and on this occasion he took part in an expedition for the suppression of piracy on the coasts of Borneo. After a second visit to Sarawak in 1852 as lieutenant in the *Macander*, he retired from the Navy in order to assist his uncle in the administration of the Raj. A year later the Rajah entrusted him with the difficult task of subduing a rebel Dayak chief, this was followed by a series of similar expeditions, all of which were carried out with signal success, relying almost entirely upon a force composed of Sea Dayak and Malay volunteers who armed with their native weapons served him faithfully and well. In the same year he was given the title Tuan Muda of Sarawak, and continued to bear it until he succeeded his uncle as Rajah in 1868. From 1868 onwards the second Rajah followed faithfully in the footsteps of his great predecessor, maintaining the policy of administering his country for the good of its native population. Under his rule the area of Sarawak extended from a territory of some 7,000 square miles to that of 57,000 miles. In 1888 the Rajah of Sarawak was created G.C.M.G., and at the same time, by agreement with the British Government, Sarawak, which had up to that time remained independent, became a British protectorate; and in 1904 the position of Sir Charles Brooke as Sovereign of Sarawak was formally recognised by King Edward. The Rajah married, in 1869, Miss Margaret Alice de Windt, who, as Ranee of Sarawak, survives him with three sons.

17 **Sir Somerville Arthur Gurney**, K.C.V.O., was 81 years old and was educated privately and at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. Since 1854 he had been connected with Gurney's Bank at Lynn, having been a local director since its amalgamation with Barclay & Co. in 1896, and a member of the London board since 1902. Sir Somerville Gurney was Mayor of King's Lynn in 1896-7, and was honorary secretary of the West Norfolk Foxhounds for nearly forty years. He was knighted by King Edward in 1909.

18 **Sir Alexander Richardson Binnie** was born in 1839. At the age of 23 he was employed upon the construction of the mid-Wales railways. In 1869 he went to India and served for six years in the Indian Public Works Department. He also did important pioneer work in prospecting for coal in the Central Provinces and this led to the development of the Chanda coal-field. In 1875 he returned to England, and for fifteen years he held the appointment of water engineer to Bradford, where he constructed reservoirs costing 1,000,000*l*, laid out the Nidd Valley scheme of waterworks and planned the river Wye water-supply scheme. In 1890 he became Chief Engineer to the London County Council and he held this post until 1902. During this time the tunnels under the Thames at Blackwall and Greenwich were constructed, and their value in improving the commerce of London and in assisting workpeople to get to and from their work cannot be over-estimated. For this work Queen Victoria knighted Sir Alexander Binnie.

— **John Nevil Maskelyne**, the founder of the entertainment which bears his name, was born in 1839. He was a most effective assailant of the frauds of spiritualism, and achieved a brilliant success as a public entertainer at the Egyptian Hall of which he was lessee from 1873 to 1904, and also at the St George's Hall to which his "Home of Magic" was transferred in 1905.

19. **Lady Burnett** was the daughter of the late Mr Thomas Sleap and wife of Sir David Burnett, who was Lord Mayor of London in 1912-13.

— **Lady Lucy Drury-Lowe** was in her 72nd year, and was the widow of Mr. W. B. N. Drury Lowe of Derby. She was an aunt of Lord Kilmorey.

19. **The Rev. John Sharp** was born in 1837 and was a descendant of Archbishop Sharp. He was ordained in 1861 by Archbishop Tait for work in India as Rugby-Fox master in the Robert Noble College at Masulipatam under the Church Missionary Society. He returned in 1878, when he was appointed university lecturer in Telugu at Cambridge. In 1880 Mr. Sharp was made Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society as colleague to the late Rev. C. E. B. Reed, and he retired only in 1908.

23. **Lord Abinger.** Shelley Leopold Lawrence, fifth Lord Abinger, was a son of Lieutenant-Colonel L. J. Y. C. Scarlett, a grandson of the first Lord Abinger, who was raised to the peerage in 1835, shortly after his appointment as Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Lord Abinger was born in 1872 and succeeded his cousin in 1903. In 1894 he was appointed an honorary Attaché to the British Legation at Berne, and three years later he was transferred to Stockholm where he remained two years. During the European War he had been serving in the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, in which he held the honorary rank of Commander. He married, in 1890, the only daughter of the late Sir William Arthur Whyte, but he left no children, and is succeeded in the title by his brother, the Hon. Robert Brooke Campbell Scarlett, who was born in 1876.

— **Queen Ranavalona**, the last Queen of Madagascar, was born in 1864 and succeeded to the throne in 1883. In 1896 the island was declared a French Colony, but General Gallieni on finding the Court a centre of intrigue, abolished the sovereignty and exiled in 1897 the Queen to Réunion. In 1899 she was removed to Algeria.

25. **Duke of Tamames, Dean of the Grandees of Spain**, was born in 1853, heir to one of the oldest and most illustrious families of Galicia. He sat in the Cortes for many years, and became a Senator in 1911, and on one occasion held the office of Civil Governor of Madrid. But it was as patron of art, literature, and sport that he was best known. In 1873 he married a sister of the late Duke of Alba, by whom he had six children, all of whom survive him. He was a nephew of the Empress Eugénie.

— **Mrs. Anthony Trollope**, the widow of the novelist, was 96 years of age. She married Anthony Trollope

in 1844 in Dublin, and outlived him for thirty-five years

27. **Caroline Marchioness of Ely** was a daughter of the late George Caithness, and was married to the fourth Marquess of Ely in 1875.

— **The Rev. Sir Vyell Donnithorne Vyvyan**, ninth baronet, was born in 1826. He succeeded his uncle in 1879. Sir Vyell was ordained deacon in 1854 and priest in 1855. In 1857 he married Louisa Mary Frederica, third daughter of Richard Bourchier, and is succeeded by his eldest son, Colonel Courtenay Bourchier Vyvyan, C.B., C.M.G., who was born in 1858.

28. **Hon. Caroline Mary Frances Jervis** was 93 years of age. She was the only daughter of William Jervis, eldest son of the second Viscount St. Vincent, nephew of the Earl St. Vincent. Her brother succeeded to the title in 1859, and in the following year she was raised to the rank of a Viscount's daughter.

— **Lieutenant-Colonel Nathaniel Newnham-Davis**, soldier, playwright, and author of many books on food and cooking, was educated at Harrow. He joined the Buffs in 1873, and on retiring from the Army in 1894 he joined the staff of the *Sporting Times* and remained there until 1912. From 1894 to 1900 he was editor of the *Man of the World*. In 1915, having applied for re-employment in the Army, he was appointed an officer of the Military Guard over the prisoners of war at Alexandra Palace.

29. **Edouard de Reszke**, the famous Polish Bass singer, was born at Warsaw in 1855. He had his first singing lessons from his eldest brother Jean, and then afterwards went to Milan and Naples and later to Paris. After making a name in Petrograd, Moscow, and other Continental cities, he sang regularly at Covent Garden for twelve years onwards, from 1888. He sang in Wagner Operas, but he himself much preferred French and Italian opera, and his fame was made largely in the parts of Leporello, Mephistopheles, and the Friar in "Romeo and Juliet". He started a school of singing in London in 1907, but after a year went to Warsaw to teach and later to Paris, where he taught until a year before the European War.

— **Leopold de Rothschild** was born in 1845, the youngest of the three

sons of Baron Lionel de Rothschild, M.P. He was educated at home and afterwards at Cambridge, and on leaving the university travelled extensively. After the death of his father in 1879 he became associated with his two elder brothers in the conduct of the banking house in New Court. Both the younger brothers were somewhat eclipsed by the masterful character of Lord Rothschild, and it is curious to note that Mr de Rothschild's public life on a large scale did not begin until the death of his brother in 1915. He then took upon himself almost all the public offices filled by his brother, and he especially interested himself in the Jewish community. As President of the United Synagogue he became the Titular Chief of Anglo-Jewry. Mr. de Rothschild had many tastes outside finance, charity, and sport. He was a keen art collector, an ardent gardener, and although not a keen politician he was very interested in all questions concerning the dignity and greatness of England. His career as a financier has no personal history, it is bound up with that of the House of Rothschild. For the past forty years Mr Leopold de Rothschild had been one of the most prominent figures in Tuif circles, and his membership of the Jockey Club dates from 1891. He married, in 1881, Miss Marie Perugia of Trieste and leaves three sons.

30 **Miss Sarah Martha Baker, D.Sc., F.L.S.**, died at the early age of 30. She was a graduate of University College, Gower Street, with which she had been associated as student and

lecturer for ten years. She held a Quain lectureship in botany, and had studied chemistry abroad and under Sir William Ramsay. Her chief interest was botanical chemistry, and her original work led to her election as a Fellow of the Linnaean Society in 1912. She had written in all about a dozen papers dealing with chemistry of botany.

31 **Sir Richard Burbidge** was born in Wilts in 1847. As a boy he was apprenticed to a tea merchant in Oxford Street, his parents paying 100 guineas to have him taught the business. When his apprenticeship was over at the age of 19, he started business on his own account in wines, groceries, and provisions. After fourteen years' successful trading he obtained an appointment as general superintendent of the Army and Navy Auxiliary. He extended and built up this business, and then in 1882 he was offered and accepted the general managership of William Whiteley's. In 1891 he joined Harrod's, which had just before been converted into a limited company with Sir Alfred Newton as chairman. When he joined the firm the year's profits amounted to 16,071*l*, in 1909 the amount had increased to 198,322*l*. Besides his exceptionally successful business career Sir Richard Burbidge's public services were varied and numerous, and his philanthropic gifts were most generous. Sir Richard was twice married, and by his first wife he had two sons and four daughters. The baronetcy passes to his elder son, who was born in 1872.

JUNE.

2 **Dr. William Henry Besant** was the son of Mr. William Besant, merchant, of Portsmouth, and a brother of the late Sir Walter Besant, and was born in 1828. He was educated at St. Paul's School, Southsea, and at the age of 16 he won a classical scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He entered St John's College, Cambridge, in 1846 and took his degree as Senior Wrangler in 1850 and was first Smith's Prizeman. He was elected a Fellow of his College in the succeeding year and appointed a mathematical lecturer in 1853. He vacated his Fellowship in 1859, not having taken Holy Orders, but remained a college lecturer until 1889. For many years Dr. Besant was one of the most successful mathematical coaches in Cambridge; he

published some text-books on mathematical subjects, and contributed a number of papers to the mathematical journals. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1871.

4 **Lord St. Audries** was 63 years of age. He was educated at Eton and Balliol College. In 1875 he entered the Grenadier Guards and served in the Egyptian Campaign in 1882. From 1889 to 1891 he was aide-de-camp to the Governor of Victoria. He retired from the Army in 1892, and in the same year succeeded his father in the baronetcy and was returned to the House of Commons; and from this time until 1911 as Sir Alexander Fuller-Acland-Hood he represented the Wellington Division of Somerset.

From December, 1900, to August, 1902, he was Vice-Chamberlain of the Household to Queen Victoria and King Edward VII. and then became Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury, which latter office he held until the end of 1905. As the Chief Whip of the Unionist Party he took an active part in Parliamentary life. He was elevated to the peerage in June, 1911. In 1888 he married the Hon. Mildred Rose Eveleigh De Moleyns, daughter of the fourth Baron Ventry, and leaves two sons and two daughters. He is succeeded by his eldest son, the Hon. Alexander Fuller-Acland-Hood, who is 28 years of age.

5 **Colonel Richard William Charles Winsloe, C.B.**, was born in 1835. After being educated at Edinburgh Academy, he joined, at the age of 18, the 15th Foot, volunteering for service the following year with the 21st Royal North British Fusiliers (now the Royal Scots Fusiliers), and with this regiment he took part in the Crimean campaign, receiving the medal with clasp and the Turkish medal. As a major he served with the 2nd Battalion of the 21st in South Africa. He was mentioned in dispatches, and in addition to the medal with clasp was awarded a brevet lieutenant-colonelcy. The next year he took part in the Transvaal campaign, and found himself besieged with 140 of his men and a certain number of civilians in the small fort at Potchefstroom. His defence of this place for three months was one of the most striking episodes of the campaign. In January, 1883, he was promoted to the command of the 2nd Battalion and with it served in the Burmese expedition three years later, commanding the force at the relief of Thabyabin. He was again mentioned in dispatches and received the medal. In 1887 he was placed on half-pay, returning three years later. In 1889 he was awarded the C.B., and in 1893 was selected for a reward for distinguished service. He received the Jubilee medal in 1887 and the clasp at the celebration of ten years later.

7 **Dr. Carl Hermann Ethé**, the Oriental Scholar, was born at Stiabsund in 1844 and came to this country in 1872. He was lecturer in Oriental languages at Munich University, 1867-71. He had been engaged for many years in compiling a catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the library at the India Office. From the Bodleian Library at Oxford, where he described

and catalogued the great collection of Persian, Turkish, Pushtu, Hindustani, and Arabic manuscripts, he went in 1875 to the Welsh University at Aberystwith. There he taught Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic and Syraic, Persian, Turkish and Sanskrit, besides lecturing in German and most of the Romance languages. In 1915, however, as a result of local feeling owing to his nationality, Dr. Ethé's connexion with the college ceased.

7 **Alderman William Cotton**, Nationalist member of Parliament for South County Dublin, was 76 years of age. He was manager and finally Chairman of the Alliance Gas Company, a position which he held until 1915 when he retired. Mr. Cotton was Lord Mayor of Dublin in 1911.

8 **Commander Charles Elphinstone Fleeming Cunningham-Graham, M.V.O., R.N.**, Groom in Waiting to His Majesty the King, was born in 1854 and educated at Harrow and in H M S *Britannia*. He served in the Navy from 1867 to 1886. In 1880 he was awarded the Royal Humane Society's silver medal for saving the life of a waterman at Portsmouth. On resigning his commission he joined the Royal National Lifeboat Institution, in which he served for twenty-three years, assisting on various occasions in saving life, and writing many articles on lifeboat matters. On joining the Emergency List at the invitation of the Admiralty in 1901, he had his commission restored to him and was made commander in 1903.

9. **Thomas McKenny Hughes, M.A., F.R.S.**, Woodwardian Professor of Geology at Cambridge, was a member of a distinguished family. His grandfather, Sir Thomas McKenny, took a prominent part in Catholic emancipation in Ireland, and his father became Bishop of St. Asaph. He was 85 years of age. Educated at Leamington and Llandovery Colleges, he took his degree at Cambridge in 1857 as a member of Trinity College. In 1860 he was appointed Secretary to the British Consul at Rome and was left Acting Consul in that city in 1860 and 1861. In the latter year he joined the Geological Survey of Great Britain and served on it until 1878 when he succeeded Professor Sedgwick at Cambridge. In 1890 appeared two volumes, "The Life and Letters of Sedgwick" by Clark and Hughes. Another task which Hughes had set himself in connexion with his predecessor he had

the satisfaction of seeing completed, and the Sedgwick Museum was opened by King Edward in 1904. During his tenure of office Hughes did much original work in geology and in archaeology. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1889 and received the Lyell Medal of the Geological Society in 1891. He was a Professorial Fellow of Clare College and Chevalier of the Order SS Maurice et Lazarus (Italy).

11. James Chambers, K.C., Solicitor-General for Ireland, was the son of Mr. Joseph Chambers, of Darkley, Co. Armagh. Mr. Chambers was called to the Irish Bar in 1886, he took silk in 1902, and was elected a Bencher of King's Inns, Dublin, in 1905.

— **Brigadier-General St. John Fancourt Michell Fancourt, C.B.,** was 70 years of age. Educated at Woolwich and gazetted to the 5th Royal Irish Lancers in 1869, he passed into the Indian Army a few years later. He was intelligence officer for the North-East Frontier in 1881-83 and served with the expedition which added Upper Burma to our dominions. He commanded the troops in the Assam, Rohilkund, and Allahabad divisions successively. He retired in 1901 and attained the rank of Brigadier-General in 1916. He was a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society and wrote many articles and monographs on geographical and ethnographical questions, particularly in relation to the North-East Frontier.

— **The Earl of Haddington** was born in 1827, the eldest son of the tenth earl by his marriage with Georgina Markham, daughter of a former Archdeacon of York. Lord Haddington was much interested in agriculture and encouraged scientific farming in many ways. He was also a keen sportsman, one of his favourite forms of sport being coursing, he was also very fond of fox-hunting. From an early period he took an active interest in the old Yeomanry and was Honorary Colonel of the Lothians and Border Horse. He was President of the Haddington Territorial Association and was also Lord Lieutenant for Haddington. He succeeded to the title in 1870, and became a representative peer for Scotland four years later. In 1902 he was created a Knight of the Thistle and was an A.D.C. to His Majesty and Captain of the Royal Company of Archers. In 1854 he

married the daughter of Sir John Warrender, fifth baronet. The heir to the title is his grandson, George Baillie-Hamilton, Lord Binning, who was born in 1894.

11. Sir Joseph Bithell Leach was 75 years of age, and founder of the firm of J. B. & B. Leach, auctioneers. He was a Justice of the Peace for the County of Lancashire and the County Borough of the Congregational Union, and a life-long temperance worker. He received a knighthood only a week before his death.

— **Sir William Christopher Macdonald** was born in Prince Edward Island in 1831. At the age of 16 he emigrated to the United States and spent two or three years in Boston and New York. Before he was 21 he came back north to Montreal. There he started the tobacco factory which brought him many millions of dollars. His generosity in the cause of education was most lavish, and McGill, the great Protestant University of Montreal, received his largest gifts. His creation of the Macdonald College for the improvement of rural educational conditions was a great idea and was opened in 1907 as part of the University. In all, his gifts for practical education in Canada must have exceeded 2,000,000/. He succeeded Lord Strathcona in March, 1914, as Chancellor and President of McGill University.

— **Major William Hoey Kearney Redmond** died of wounds received in action in France on June 7. He was born in Wexford in 1861. His family were of the Catholic gentry class and their associations with Wexford go back for many years, both his grandfather and father sat in the House of Commons as member for the borough of Wexford. William Redmond intended to adopt the Army as a profession, and in 1881 was a lieutenant in the County Wexford Militia battalion of the Royal Irish Regiment; but he resigned his commission to take part in the Land League movement, one of the results of which was that he spent part of the next year in Kilmainham Gaol as "a suspect" with Parnell, Dillon, Sexton, William O'Brien, and many other Nationalist leaders. Shortly after the release of the "suspects" John and William Redmond were sent by Parnell on a mission to Australia to raise funds in support of the Nationalist movement. The Redmonds succeeded in collecting

15,000L During their absence in 1883 a vacancy occurred in the representation of the borough of Wexford. William was nominated as a Parnellite and he beat his opponent by almost three votes to one. He sat for Wexford Borough until 1885, when he was returned for an Ulster constituency, County Fermanagh. Mr. Redmond was again imprisoned in 1888, and this time it was three months' imprisonment in Wexford Gaol for inciting to resistance to the Sheriff, on the occasion of an eviction. The Redmonds remained faithful to Parnell at "the split" in 1890. At the General Election in 1892 William won East Clare for the Parnellites and continued to sit for that constituency till his death. When the European War broke out he instantly recognised that it was the duty of Ireland to take her full share in the struggle. The Irish Division, raised in the winter of 1914, was recruited mainly from the Nationalist and Catholic classes of the South and West of Ireland. One of the first to join was William Redmond though he was then well over military age. He received his commission as captain in the Royal Irish Regiment in which he had served thirty-three years previously. The Division left for France in the winter of 1915. For his services at the front Captain Redmond was promoted major and mentioned by Sir Douglas Haig in dispatches. In December, 1916, Major Redmond, on his return to the House of Commons, made a thrilling and remarkable speech where he made an appeal to North and South to meet on the floor of a common Irish Assembly. His last speech in the House of Commons was made on March 7, 1917, when he seconded Mr. T. P. O'Connor's motion for the immediate bringing into operation of Home Rule. William Redmond was one of the greatest examples of those who took all risks for the things they believed in.

12. **The Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.**, Principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, was born in 1856. He proceeded to Glasgow after attending the Highlanders' Academy, Greenock, and had a distinguished career at the University. In 1895 he published his "Studies in Theology," consisting of a series of lectures he had delivered in Chicago Theological Seminary. Dr. Denney wrote several important works on Biblical theology. The Universities of Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Princeton as well as the Chicago Theological Semi-

nary conferred on him the D.D. degree.

14. **Teresa Carreño**, the pianist, was born at Caracas in Venezuela in 1853. At a very early age she went to study in Paris, under Mathias, where she acquired some of the Chopin tradition, and later on she had lessons from Rubinstein. Her career as a pianist began in 1889, and she was playing in London as late as 1912. Her style was singularly pure and free from mannerisms.

— **Arthur Dewar**, who took the courtesy title of Lord Dewar on his appointment as a Judge of the Court of Session, was the fourth surviving son of John Dewar, distiller, Perth, and was born in 1860. Educated at the Academy at Perth and Edinburgh University, where he graduated in 1882, he was admitted to the Scots Bar in 1885. In 1892, owing to his attachment to the Liberal cause, he was appointed extra Advocate-Depute for the Glasgow circuit, and held the appointment till 1895, when the Conservatives came into power. In 1899 he successfully contested the South Edinburgh Parliamentary division, but in 1900 Dewar was defeated. In May, 1904, he took silk, two years later he re-entered the House of Commons as member for his former constituency; and in 1909 he was appointed Solicitor-General for Scotland, an office which he held till his promotion to the Bench in April, 1910.

15. **Harry Buxton Forman, C.B.**, was born in 1842 and educated at Teignmouth. At the age of 18 he entered the Post Office and retired, after forty-seven years' service, in 1907. He became a principal clerk in 1885, Assistant Secretary and Controller of Packet Services in 1893, and Second Secretary in 1905. For years he was associated with the foreign branch of the Secretary's office. Mr Buxton Forman did valuable work as a civil servant, but he did even more valuable work as a man of letters. His first published book was "Our Living Poets" (1871). Five years later he began to issue his most important book, the edition of Shelley's prose and poetry in eight volumes, which appeared between 1876 and 1880. In 1886 he published a bibliography of Shelley; and for the Shelley Society, of which he was an original member, he edited several reprints and facsimiles, his introductions to which are of high value. In 1883 came his first

edition of Keats's poetry followed by several editions in later years. Among other publications were volumes on "Elizabeth Barrett Browning and her Scarcer Books" (1896) and "The Books of William Morris" (1897).

15. **Sir Francis Beaufort Palmer**, the noted company lawyer, was born in July, 1845, and educated at Eton and University College, Oxford. His father, the Rev. William Palmer, was associated with the Tractarian movement at Oxford and was a friend of Cardinal Newman and Mr. Gladstone. Sir Francis Palmer was called to the Bar in 1873 by the Inner Temple, of which he became a Bencher in 1907. With his increasing work in Chambers he found it impossible to deal with work in Court, and in the early nineties he devoted himself wholly to Chamber work. During most of the time he was passing his various books on company law through new editions, and they all became famous. In Lincoln's Inn, where he had practised for many years, he was known as a draftsman without rival during the latter part of the nineteenth century. He married, in 1898, one of the daughters of the late Baron de Hochpied Larpent, and there have been three children of the marriage.

— **Lieutenant-Colonel Thomas Colclough Watson, V.C.**, was the youngest son of the late Thomas Colclough Watson, and was born in 1867. He joined the Royal Engineers early in 1888. His V.C. was won on the North-West Frontier of India on May 20, 1898. He went out to Mesopotamia with the Forces during the European War in 1915, and contracted an illness there, from which he died. Colonel Watson married, in 1892, Edythe, younger daughter of the late Major-General John Whateley Welchman, C.B., Indian Army, who with one son survives him.

— **Miss Yeatman** was one of the great workers of South London. She was a sister of the Bishop of Southwark and joined with him in founding the community of Grey Ladies at Blackheath, and supported him otherwise in many directions in his work there.

21. **Colonel Sir Morgan George Lloyd, K.C.B.**, was a son of Mr. Owen Lloyd of Lisadurn, Co. Roscommon, his mother being a sister of a former Lord de Freyne. He was 75 years of age. He served in the King's Dragoon Guards, and from 1885 to 1903 commanded the Royal Irish Regi-

ment (Militia). His knighthood was among the coronation honours in 1911.

22. **Sir Joseph Lyons**, the chairman and founder of the business of Messrs. J. Lyons (Limited), was the son of Nathaniel Lyons, of Newmarket and London. He was born in South London and educated at the borough Jewish Schools and a private academy. In his earlier years he was a painter in water-colours and used to exhibit at the Institute and elsewhere; but he gave this up and occupied his time and thoughts on catering, and it was to this project that he owed his fame and fortune. He took counsel with his friends Mr. Isidore Gluckstein and Mr. Montague Gluckstein, and they worked together. Their work began at exhibitions and from that the enterprise spread to restaurants. The first tea-shop was opened in 1894, and in 1917 there were more than 200 of those gold-and-white-fronted tea-shops in London. To Sir Joseph Lyons was due the introduction of athletics into the Territorial plan, and it was he who promoted the first meeting, which took place at the Stadium, Shepherd's Bush, in June, 1909, and the first Grand National Territorial Sports Meeting in July, 1910. In the following year he was knighted for his services to the London Territorial Association, and he was also a D.L. for the County of London.

24. **Dr. James Usher Huxley** was born in 1834. He had his first professional education under Dr. Bell, at Rochester, being "apprenticed" to him, as the custom then was. He then passed to King's College, where he had a very distinguished career, winning several scholarship prizes in physiology and medicine, and among them the "Brodie Medal," then recently founded. Whilst still a young man, he was appointed house surgeon to the Exeter Hospital, a post which he held for seven years, when he moved and set up in Torquay. At this place, which was then at the height of its fame as a health resort, he made himself a position of much note and had many famous patients. After forty years' practice he retired in his 75th year and went to live in Oxford. He was a man of many tastes, a skilled musician, a collector of works of art, and he amassed a large library, especially of books on art and geography.

— **Mrs. Katharine Sarah Macquoid**, the novelist, was the third

daughter of Mr. Thomas Thomas, a London merchant, and was born in 1824. At the age of 17 she was taken to France where she lived for some years. In 1851 she married the late Mr. T. R. Macquoid, R.I., the water-colour and black and-white artist. It was at her husband's suggestion that she began to write, and in 1862 her first novel was published, "A Bad Beginning," the story of a French marriage. It was successful and was followed by between fifty and sixty stories, but probably her best story was "Patty" (1871), this book deservedly had a great vogue and firmly established the author's position. Mrs. Macquoid also made her mark as the writer of delightful travel books, such as "Through Normandy," "Through Brittany," "In the Ardennes," "Pictures in Umbria," and "In the Volcanic Eifel," which were illustrated by her husband.

25 Right Rev. Bishop Lewis Clayton, Assistant Bishop to the Bishop of Peterborough since 1912, and formerly Suffragan Bishop of Leicester. He was born in 1838 and educated at King's College School and at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1860 with a second class in the Classical Tripos. He was ordained in the following year by Dr. J. C. Wigram, Bishop of Rochester, and in 1872 was appointed vicar of St. James's, Dallington. In 1887 Dr Magee, then Bishop of Peterborough, made him a residentiary canon of his Cathedral. In 1903 he was appointed Suffragan Bishop of Leicester.

26. Catharine Lady Crawshaw was married in 1851 to Mr. Thomas Brooks of Cawshaw, Lancashire, who was raised to the peerage as Baron Crawshaw in 1892. She had been a widow since 1908 and leaves two sons and two daughters.

— **Brigadier-General Gerald Edward Holland, C.B., C.M.G., C.I.E., D.S.O., R.E.**, was born in 1860, the second son of the late Mr. Dennis Holland, of Dublin. He joined the Royal Indian Marine in 1880, was promoted lieutenant two years later and commander in 1893. During the South African War he served on the Naval Transport Staff at Durban and as Divisional Officer, being three times mentioned in dispatches and being created C.I.E. For three years he was a principal port officer at Rangoon, retiring from the Royal Indian Marine twelve years ago, when he was appointed

maine superintendent, London and North-Western Railway at Holyhead. He was awarded the D.S.O. in 1890 and made a C.M.G. in 1916, and he also held the Officer Order of Leopold of Belgium. At the outbreak of the European War General Holland took up an appointment with the Royal Engineers as Deputy Director of Inland Water Transport in France. He was on sick leave from active service when he died.

27. Edgar Athelstane Browne, F.R.C.S. Edin., and M.Ch. Liverpool, was the eldest son of Hablot Knight Browne ("Phiz"), the famous illustration of Dickens's works. As an eye surgeon Mr. Browne was at one time in the leading ranks of his profession, and his work "How to Use the Ophthalmoscope" is a standard work and of great help to all medical students. He possessed much of his father's talent, and the rough sketches of the two men could scarcely be told apart. Mr. Browne was the author of many plays, and of an entertaining volume entitled "'Phiz' and Dickens."

28. Sir George Birdwood, C.S.I., K.C.I.E., the eminent Anglo-Indian, was born at Belgaum in the Deccan in 1832. He was the eldest son of General Christopher Birdwood, sometime Commissary-General to the Bombay Army. At the age of 7 he was sent to Plymouth to be educated, and at 16 he went to Edinburgh to qualify for the Indian Medical Service, and he took his M.D. degree and the diploma of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1854. At the close of that year he was appointed to the Indian Medical Staff on the Bombay Establishment. After two or three years of military duty he was appointed to the Indian Navy frigate *Ajdaha* in the Persian Gulf in 1856-57. The *Ajdaha* joined in the bombardment of Mohammerah, and Birdwood earned the Persian medal with clasp. He was back in Bombay in time to help his father and the Commissioner of Police in a round of visits which did much to keep the city loyal and calm throughout the Mutiny. Birdwood had enormous influence with the people, and became interpreter between the Government and them. He promoted the cause of higher education and was on the Bench of Justices, then the municipal authority in Bombay, and in 1864 he was elected Sheriff. All these labours so broke down his health that he had to leave India in 1868. In 1867 he had been placed in charge of the

Indian exhibits at the Paris Exhibition, and in 1869 the Duke of Argyll, then Indian Secretary, put him over the Indian Collections in a series of special exhibitions begun at South Kensington in 1871, and at the close of the series he was permanently appointed to the India Office, and he became later Special Assistant to the Revenue and Statistics Department. In 1877 he was made a C.S.I., a year later he was knighted, and was long after made K.C.I.E. Many other honours came to him, and the India Office retained his services for five years beyond the ordinary age limit. Towards 1881 the idea occurred to him to commemorate Lord Beaconsfield's death by the institution of Primrose Day. Sir George Birdwood's literary output was prodigious, and his name is associated with the many works on Indian subjects.

29. Colonel Sir Anthony Arthur Weldon, C.V.O., D.S.O., sixth baronet, His Majesty's Lieutenant for County Kildare, was born in 1863 and succeeded to the baronetcy in 1900. He was educated at Charterhouse

and Trinity College, Cambridge, and joined the 4th Battalion of the Leinster Regiment in 1885, seeing service with the Natal Field Force under Sir Redvers Buller in the South African War. From 1895 to 1900 he was aide de camp to Lord Wolseley. During the European War he was in command of a battalion of the Leinster Regiment and did good service at Limerick during the Irish rebellion. In 1900 he received the D.S.O. and in 1911 the C.V.O. He married a daughter of the late Colonel Varty Rogers, and is succeeded by his son, Anthony Edward.

30. Thomas Henry Carson, K.C., was 73 years of age. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he became first gold medallist in both classics and philosophy at that College. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1869, took silk in 1901, and became a Bencher six years later. He was joint editor of Carson's "Real Property Statutes," Tudor's "Leading Cases in Real Property and Conveyancing," and of the Equity articles in Lord Halsbury's "Laws of England."

JULY.

2. Sir Robert Joseph Crosthwaite, K.C.S.I., was 76 years of age. He was educated at Merchant Taylor's School and Brasenose College, and was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple in 1868. In 1863 he entered the Indian Civil Service and went to the North-West Provinces. His career was chiefly on the judicial side, he was also a member of the Viceroy's Council, and carried out the political work of the Agent of the Governor-General, first in Central India and then in Rajputana.

— **Titu Maiorescu**, the well-known Rumanian statesman, was born at Craiova in 1840. He studied first in Vienna and afterwards in the Universities of Berlin and Paris. Soon after his return to Rumania he was appointed Professor of Philosophy in the University of Jassy, and in 1871 was elected Deputy in the Chamber and held various offices. In 1911 he was appointed Foreign Minister, and in 1913, the year of the second Balkan War, he was Prime Minister, at the head of a Coalition Cabinet, and presided over the Bukarest Conference.

2 Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree, the great actor, was born in 1858, the second son of Julius Beerbohm and Constantia Draper, and educated at Schnepfenthal College in Germany, and it was not until 1877 that he began to make his mark on the stage as a professional. He acted in good companies and made a notable success in 1880 in one or two French plays in London. That year he was engaged by Sir Charles Wyndham after he had acted Sir Andrew Aguecheek in "Twelfth Night." In 1884 he made one of his most successful hits as the Rev. Robert Spalding in "The Private Secretary." In 1887 he took the lease of the Haymarket and retained the management of that theatre until 1896, and one of the most memorable of his characterisations during this period was his Svengali in the play "Trilby." In 1896 he visited the United States, and on his return to London he opened His Majesty's Theatre which had been entirely rebuilt. From that date Tree produced innumerable pieces and frequently revived Shakespeare, going through almost the whole gallery of Shakespearian heroes from the grave to the boisterous. His plays were always

supported by a richness of scene and accessory which gave pleasure to the great majority of playgoers, although in many quarters he was much criticised for this. In 1907 he undertook a tour in Germany, in the course of which he produced a great deal of Shakespeare and was decorated by the Kaiser. He inaugurated an annual Shakespearian festival, of one week, in 1905, in which in a different play each night he sustained the leading part, the festival extended to two months in 1911. Tree did not confine his energies to the stage, he was famous as a witty talker and an amusing *raconteur*, and he also was successful in his literary ventures. His versatility found another outlet in lecturing, and during his visit to America in 1916 and part of 1917 he turned his gift to excellent account in the cause of the Allies. Tree had not long returned from America when he had a slight accident from the effects of which he never recovered. He was knighted by King Edward in 1909.

3. Dadabhai Naoroji, the father of Indian Nationalism and the first Indian to sit in the House of Commons, was born in Bombay in 1825. He was descended from an uninterrupted line of the Zoroastrian priesthood, and his mother's determination to secure for him the best education led him to break the immemorial family record of continuous sacerdotal service. He was one of the first batch of students in the Elphinstone College, and he became assistant to the mathematical professor there, being the first Indian to hold such a position in a Government College. He ardently espoused by speeches and writing the cause of educational and social reform, and was one of the founders, in 1853, of the Bombay Association, a progenitor of the Congress movement. In 1855 Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji came to London as a partner in the branch house then being established here by the mercantile Cama family, the first of such purely Indian enterprises in Britain. The Indian Reform Society, of which John Bright was a conspicuous member, welcomed his co-operation, and in the course of a few years he ceased to take an active part in the business and became a politician. He founded the London Indian Society, which was chiefly composed of young students, and the leading idea of all his speeches and writings was that the Indian connexion with the country, with its inevitable concomitant of Home Charges, constituted a "drain" upon India

without economic equivalent which kept her poor. In 1874 Mr. Naoroji accepted the Dewanship of Baroda, but he was unable to check the misconduct of his chief, the Gaekwar Mulharao, and the continued licentious conduct of that chief led to his deposition. He then settled for a time in Bombay, and in 1885 became a member of the local Legislature and took an active part in establishing the Indian National Congress and presided at the second session in Calcutta in 1886. Earlier in the year he stood for Parliament as a Home Ruler, but he was defeated, but in 1892 he was elected to the Home Rule Parliament by only three votes. The event was hailed with enthusiasm in India, and Gladstone warmly welcomed his Parsi follower. He was appointed to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and in 1893 he went to India to preside at the Congress at Lahore. At the dissolution of Parliament in 1895 he failed to secure re-election. The remaining great event of his life was his presidency of the National Congress, for the third time, at Calcutta at the close of 1906. In the autumn of 1907, owing to a serious illness he retired to his native land and settled near Bombay, where he died.

3. J. E. Williams was 61 years of age. For over forty years he was connected with the Railwaymen's Union in various capacities. He was appointed General Secretary in 1910, and when the Society became the National Union of Railwaymen he retained the position. He served on the Advisory Council of Labour, and was a member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress. In 1916 he visited Canada as a delegate from the British Trades Unions to the American Congress of Labour. In December, 1916, he resigned the General Secretaryship of the National Union of Railwaymen on account of ill-health.

4. Colonel Cornwallis-West, Lord Lieutenant of Denbighshire, was the only surviving son of Frederick Richard West of Ruthin Castle. He was 82 years of age. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1862, and in 1895 assumed the prefix Cornwallis by deed poll. Colonel Cornwallis-West was member of Parliament for West Denbighshire from 1885 until 1892, when, becoming a Unionist after the Home Rule split, he was defeated. He was the oldest magistrate for

Denbighshire, a Justice of the Peace for Hampshire, and hon. colonel 1st Volunteer Battalion Royal Welsh Fusiliers. One of the most prominent public men in North Wales for over half a century, he was intimately associated with every public movement, especially social, educational, and religious. He married Mary Adelaine, the eldest daughter of the Rev. Frederick and Lady Olivia Fitzpatrick, who survives him

10. **Captain the Hon. Edward Kay-Shuttleworth** was killed in a motor-cycle accident in England, when he was on the point of returning to the front, where he had already seen much service. Born in 1890, he was the second and only surviving son of Lord Shuttleworth. He was a barrister of the Inner Temple and joined a service battalion of the Rifle Brigade at the outbreak of the European War.

11. **Colonel Cunliffe Martin, C.B.**, was in his 84th year. He was in the Bengal Cavalry, and during the Mutiny was severely wounded in the capture of Dhar and action of Mundisore, being mentioned in dispatches. He was also mentioned for his services at the capture of Magdala in the Abyssinian Expedition, 1867-68, and in the Afghan War, 1880. For the latter he received a medal with clasp and bronze star.

12. **Patrick O'Brien**, Nationalist M.P. for Kilkenny, and for many years one of the principal Whips of his party, entered Parliament in 1886. Though born at Tullamore, King's County, in 1853, he was brought up in Liverpool, and became a prominent figure in the Nationalist movement there. He was invited by Parnell to stand as the Nationalist candidate when a vacancy occurred in North Monaghan, he polled double the votes of his Conservative opponent, and in the General Election in the same year defeated his opponent by an equally good majority. With the Chief Secretaryship of Mr. Balfour came the passing of the Coercion Act, and Patrick O'Brien became one of the most active agents of an agitation which the Nationalists started against it, and he was several times imprisoned. At the disruption of the Nationalist Party on the question of Parnell's leadership, O'Brien, who was then again in prison under the Coercion Act, sided with his leader. He lost his seat for North Monaghan in consequence at the General Election of

1892, and was out of Parliament until 1895, when he was elected as a Parliamentite for the borough of Kilkenny, which he represented until his death.

15. **James Crabbe-Watt, K.C.**, Sheriff of Elgin, Moray, and Nairn, was born in 1853. He was educated at Stonehaven and Edinburgh University and began life as a journalist, becoming at 18 the youngest editor in the country. In 1890 he was called to the Scottish Bar and within thirteen years was made a King's Counsel. He took part in political work for forty years, contesting Ross and Cromarty in the Unionist interest in 1906 and Banffshire in January, 1910.

— **Dowager Countess of Lonsdale** was in her 85th year. The daughter of the late George F. Caulfield, she married, in 1852, the third Earl of Lonsdale, who died in 1876. She was the mother of the present earl.

16. **Sir Charles Stamp Milburn, Bart.**, was 88 years of age. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, succeeded his father in 1907, and was head of the firm of William Milburn & Co., shipowners and merchants, Newcastle-on-Tyne. He was unmarried and is succeeded in the title by his brother, Second Lieutenant Leonard John Milburn, of the Household Cavalry, who has been on active service since the beginning of the European War.

20. **Sir Charles William Cayzer, Bart.**, was born in Bombay in 1869, and was the eldest son of Sir Charles Cayzer, the first baronet, who died in September, 1916. He was educated at Rugby and Christ Church, Oxford, and became a partner in the firm of Cayzer, Irvine & Co., shipowners, which was founded by his father, and a director of the Clan Line Steamers (Ltd.). He retired in 1911. In 1898 he married a daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Jennings White and had five children. He is succeeded by his son Lieutenant Charles William Cayzer, of the Hussars. Sir Charles Cayzer was the author of a number of poetical and other works.

— **Dr. Edwin Charles Clark**, formerly Regius Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge University, was born in 1835 and received his education at Shrewsbury School. Passing from Shrewsbury to Trinity College, Cambridge, he gained great successes in

classics and mathematics. His election to a Fellowship at Trinity came as a fitting culmination to a brilliant undergraduate career. On leaving Cambridge he chose the Bar as a profession and went to London, where he devoted himself for a time to the work of a special pleader, but he returned after a few years to Cambridge, where he spent the remainder of his long and useful life. In 1873 the Chair of Regius Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge became vacant, and Clark, who had been acting as Lecturer in Law during several terms, was appointed to it and held it till 1914. As Regius Professor he became also professional Fellow of St. John's, and head of the Law Faculty, and to the work of that Faculty he devoted the greater part of his energies. Professor Clark's contributions to legal literature were characterised by considerable learning. His three principal works are his "Early Roman Law," which appeared in 1872, "Practical Jurisprudence" (1883), and "History of Roman Private Law," of which the first part, dealing with the sources, was published in 1906. Besides other works he also contributed occasionally to the pages of the *Law Quarterly Review*.

20 **Professor Jesse Benedict Carter, A.B., Ph.D., L.H.D.**, director of the American Academy in Rome, was born in New York in 1872, and educated in that city at Princeton, and for many years he studied in Germany. From 1895 to 1907 he was Assistant Professor and Professor at Princeton University. In 1907 he went to Rome as director of the American School of Classical Studies, and in 1913 was appointed director of the American Academy in Rome. The Ph.D. of Halle University was conferred upon him in 1898, and among other honours he held that of Commander of the Crown of Italy.

22. **Alfred Moseley, C.M.G.**, the well-known worker for industrial and educational efficiency, was born in 1855 and educated at Bristol Grammar School. Early in life he went to Kimberley, where he acquired a claim in the De Beers diamond field. He retired from active business pursuits at a comparatively early age, and returned to this country, where he took up tariff reform propaganda with enthusiasm. He became a member of the Tariff Commission in 1904, but before that he had organised and sent to the United States, at his own cost first in 1902, an Industrial Commission

and in the following year an Educational Commission, whose report, issued in 1903, was regarded as of very great value. In 1907 he sent 700 English school teachers to America to study the educational methods adopted in the United States and Canada, and he arranged for a return visit of 1,000 school teachers to this country. Mr. Moseley was a Knight of Grace of the Order of St John of Jerusalem, and during the South African War he equipped a hospital at the Cape, being awarded the C M G in 1900 in recognition of these services.

— **Prince Radolin** belonged to an old Polish family who were made Counts Radolin-Radolinski by Frederick William III in 1836. Prince, then Count Radolin, was born in 1841. He held some minor posts in the Prussian diplomatic service, and in 1863 married, in London, the daughter of Colonel Alfied Wakefield. He was a close friend of the Emperor and Empress Frederick. In 1884 he left the diplomatic service to become Court Marshal to the Emperor Frederick, then Crown Prince. The Emperor Frederick, on his accession, made Count Radolin a Prince and renewed his appointment as Court Marshal. He was never liked or trusted by Bismarck, and this hostility served Radolin well with the Emperor William II. In 1892 he was made Ambassador in Constantinople, in 1895 Ambassador in Petrograd, and in 1901 he was transferred to Paris. For the next nine years Prince Radolin occupied a special position in the diplomatic world. He had gone to Paris in the great hope of producing a permanent improvement in Franco German relations, and he was much satisfied by the conclusion of the Franco-German Agreement of 1909. In the summer of 1910 Prince Radolin was abruptly dismissed, and it was announced that he desired to return to Posen to take charge of his estates. It is believed that the German Government placed him under some sort of police control at an early stage of the European War.

24. **Sir Arthur Richard Jelf**, formerly a Judge of the King's Bench Division, was born in 1837, the son of the Rev. Richard William Jelf, Canon of Christ Church and Principal of King's College, London, by Emmy Countess Schlippenbach of Prussia. He was educated at Eton and Christ Church, and in 1863 was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple and joined the

Oxford circuit. He was an excellent and vigorous advocate, and his appearances before the Judicial Committee or in the House of Lords were by no means infrequent, and in some notable instances he appeared for successful appellants. He also acquired a high reputation in municipal cases and the intricate questions arising out of the Poor Law and the Law of Settlement. In November, 1901, on the retirement of Sir John Day, Jelf was raised to the Bench and retired in 1910.

24. **Brigadier-General John Arthur Tanner, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E.**, was killed at the front, where he was chief engineer of a corps. He was born in 1858 and entered the Army in June, 1877, was promoted lieutenant-colonel in July, 1906, and retired in April, 1914, being on the General Staff, India, from 1910 to 1913. He received the D.S.O. for his services in Burmah, 1885-88, and he also took part in the Chitral Expedition, 1895. In 1897 he again saw active service on the North-West Frontier of India.

27. **Lady Emma Purey-Cust**, widow of the late Dean of York, was 85 years of age. Lady Emma, who was the second daughter of the fifth Earl of Darnley, was married to the Dean in 1854.

— **Richard Kaye Puckle, C.I.E.**, was in his 87th year. Educated at Tonbridge and Haileybury he entered the Madras Civil Service in 1851 and became successively Deputy-Director of Revenue Settlement (1859), Collector and Magistrate at Tinnevalli (1866),

Director of Revenue Settlement (1874), and a member of the Board of Revenue (1879). He was made C.I.E. in 1878 and retired in 1881. He published a handbook on revenue matters and the duties of village officers.

30. **Sir Wyndham Knatchbull, Bart.**, the twelfth baronet, was 78 years of age. He succeeded his brother in 1871, and was the second son of the tenth baronet. In 1902 he married the widow of John Dillon-Browne. Sir Wyndham Knatchbull represented East Kent in the Conservative interest in 1875-76. He is succeeded by Cecil Marcus Knatchbull-Hugessen, fourth Baron Biabourne, who was born in 1863.

31. **Lord Auckland**. William Morton Eden, the fifth baron, was the son of the fourth Baron Auckland, born in 1859. He succeeded his father in 1890, and in the following year married Sybil, daughter of the late Colonel G. M. Hutton, C.B., by whom he had two sons, the elder was killed in action in 1915, and the younger, the Hon. Frederick Colvin George Eden, born in 1895, succeeds to the barony.

— **Herbert Francis Hayes Newington, F.R.C.P. Edin., and M.R.C.S. Eng.**, was 70 years of age. He was a late President of the Medical Psychological Association and late Senior Assistant Physician of the Royal Edinburgh Asylum. He specialised in mental diseases, and his works include "Some Mental Aspects of Music," "Hemiplegia in Relation to Insanity," and "Observations on Stupor."

AUGUST.

2. **Brigadier-General Alister Fraser Gordon, C.M.G., D.S.O.**, died of wounds which he received on July 29. He was the third son of the late W. G. Gordon, and was born in 1872. In 1890 he joined the Gordon Highlanders, and had seen much service in India, West Africa, and South Africa. In 1895 he was with the Relief Force during operations in Chitral, for which he received the medal with clasp. In West Africa in 1900 he took part in the operations in Ashanti, when he was again mentioned in dispatches and was awarded the D.S.O. Proceeding to South Africa in 1901 he took part in operations in the Transvaal which

extended from September, 1901, to May, 1902. He received the Queen's medal with three clasps. In the European War he went to the front at the beginning, and as early as October 19, 1914, was mentioned in dispatches. He was afterwards appointed to the command of a brigade, and his services were further rewarded by the award of the C.M.G. He married in 1908 a daughter of the late Charles Edward Edmonstone-Cranstoun, who with three children survives him.

2. **Lieut.-Colonel Albert Edward Sydney Louis Paget, M.V.O.**, the eldest son of General Sir Arthur

and Lady Paget, was 38 years of age. After passing into the Army he was declared to be medically unfit, but at the outbreak of the South African War he volunteered for service and was given his commission in the 11th Hussars. He did much useful service on the Staff and received the Queen's medal and four clasps. On returning to England he acted for some months as aide-de-camp to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. From 1908 to 1912 he acted as aide-de-camp to his father then holding the "Eastern Command." In 1914 he went out with the Expeditionary Force, and in different theatres of the war he filled various Staff appointments. He was mentioned in three dispatches and was also wounded.

4 Sir Ernest Pennington Burrows, Bart., was born in 1851. He was educated at Radley, and succeeded his brother, the second baronet, in 1904. His father, the first baronet, was the eminent physician Sir George Burrows.

6 Sir Richard McBride, late Premier of British Columbia, was born in the City of New Westminster, B.C., in 1870. After passing through the public and high schools of his native city he took the law courses at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, and was called to the Bar of British Columbia in 1892. In 1902 Mr McBride was chosen leader of the Opposition in the Provincial House, and on the fall of the Prior Government became Premier on June 1, 1903—"the youngest Premier in the Empire." In the General Election of October, 1903, he was returned to power, and again in 1907, 1909, and 1912. In that year he was made a K.C.M.G. At the end of 1915 he resigned to become Agent-General for British Columbia in London.

7. Captain Basil Hood, the well-known dramatic author, was 53 years of age. He was the youngest son of the late Sir Charles Hood, and was educated at Wellington College and the Royal Military College, Sandhurst. Afterwards he was gazetted lieutenant in the Princess of Wales's Own (Yorkshire) Regiment, and in 1893 was promoted captain, retiring in 1898. In his earlier work as librettist Basil Hood owed a great deal to the example of Gilbert. The musical comedy "The French Maid" was perhaps his best work in that line, his poetical fancy was best expressed in some pretty adaptations

of stories by Hans Andersen. His last work was the book "Young England," and the opera was produced at Drury Lane.

9. Sir Alexander McHardy was 75 years of age. He was formerly of the Royal Engineers, but for many years was officially connected with prison administration in England and Scotland. He was Chairman of the Prison Commission in Scotland, 1896, and Chairman of the Departmental Committee on Inebriates Act, 1898.

11 Lieut.-Colonel Alfred F. S. Clarke, M.D., late R.A.M.C., was 78 years of age. He was for twenty-two years Surgeon of the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, and Staff College, Camberley.

— **Lieut.-Colonel Frederic Lutmann-Johnson, D.S.O.**, was born in 1845. He entered the Army in 1865, joining the York and Lancaster Regiment. He took part in the South African War, and for his services in the operations he held the Queen's medal with three clasps and the King's medal with two clasps and was awarded the D.S.O.

— **Mrs. Alice Grenfell** was in her 75th year. She was the second daughter of Mr. H. Pyne, Assistant Commissioner of Tithes. Born and brought up in London, Miss. Grenfell married in 1869 Mr. John Granville Grenfell, assistant master at Clifton College from 1870 to 1889. She took a prominent part in the Woman Suffrage movement, both in Bristol and in London, and was a member of the Bristol School Board. For twenty years she lived at Oxford and devoted herself mainly to Egyptology, especially to the branch of mythological and amuletic scarabs, and she published a number of valuable papers in learned English, French, and Italian periodicals.

17 Hubert Henry Davies, the well-known dramatist, was born in 1876. He went to the United States when he was quite young and became a journalist and a writer of vaudeville sketches in San Francisco. He returned to England in 1901, and two years later made his first hit as a playwright. His first play, "Mrs Corrige's Necklace," was produced by Sir Charles Wyndham at Wyndham's Theatre in 1903. "Cousin Kate" was played by Mr. Cyril Maude and Miss Ellis Jeffeys in the same year. Then came

"Captain Drew on Leave", and later "The Mollusc," and after a few other good plays Mr Davies wrote "Doormats," which was considered to be his finest comedy

18. Professor Stephen Barnabas Kelleher, Erasmus Smith's Professor of Mathematics in Dublin University, was 42 years of age. He was a brilliant mathematician and gained the Fellowship of Trinity College at his first trial. Professor Kelleher was a member of the Royal Commission on Trinity College and the University of Dublin in 1906

19 The Bishop of Limerick, Dr. Edward Thomas O'Dwyer, who was in his 76th year, was ordained nearly fifty years ago. He was a Bishop for nearly thirty-one years, having been appointed while he was still a curate in a parish in Limerick city. Almost from the date of his appointment Dr O'Dwyer took a prominent part in Irish politics. He was a Home Ruler all his life; and during the Dublin Rebellion of 1916 he suddenly came before the public as a Sinn Feinei.

— Sir Protul Chandra Chatterji, C.I.E., was 69 years old. He belonged to an ancient Kulin Brahmin family in Bengal, and on being enrolled a Vakil of the High Court at the age of 21 he went to Lahore where he built up a large practice. He was appointed a Judge of the Punjab Chief Court in 1894, and remained on the Bench for twenty-four years. He played a great part in the work of the Punjab University, being for many years Dean of the Law Faculty and for five years Vice-Chancellor. He was a leading Freemason and an earnest social reformer

— Lieut. - Colonel Sir Robert Benyon Nevill Gunter, Bart., was born in 1871. He was the second baronet, succeeding his father, Sir Robert Gunter, M.P., in 1905. He formerly commanded the 3rd Battalion Yorkshire Regiment (Special Reserve) and served in South Africa, being mentioned in dispatches, and receiving both the Queen's and the King's medal, each with two clasps. He is succeeded by his son

22 Matthew Maris, the great Dutch painter, was born at the Hague in 1839, and died in London, where he had lived more than half his lifetime. In his later years he lived entirely alone, seeing only his devoted

friends; and for a very long time before his death he scarcely ever allowed any of his work to leave his studio. His pictures, both in execution and feeling, were some of the most artistic and masterly of the latter half of the nineteenth century. The finest of his earlier pictures are "The Young Cook," painted in 1871, "The Girl at the Well," in 1872, "He is Coming," in 1874, and "The Girl with the Goats," in 1875

25. Major Alfred Nicholson Leeds, F.G.S., had been intimately associated with at least two generations of British palaeontologists and had done as much as any man, not himself a professional student of the science, to advance our knowledge of the vanished monsters of the sea. In 1893 the Council of the Geological Society awarded its Lyell fund to Mr Leeds.

— Dr. W. H. Symons, who was in his 63rd year, had been Medical Officer of Health for Bath for many years. He was a pioneer in arousing the profession and the public to a sense of the fly peril. Dr. Symons was a member of the British Association Committee for the investigation of the effect of Climate upon Health and Disease.

27 The Rev. William Done Bushell was born in 1838 and educated at Weston-super-Mare and at Cheltenham College. Proceeding to St. John's College, Cambridge, he had a distinguished career and was afterwards elected a Fellow of his College. He was ordained deacon in 1864 and priest in 1866. In 1865 Mr. Bushell took a mastership at Clifton College, but after two terms went, in 1866, to Harrow. Here he remained as a master till 1899, when he became school chaplain, and here it was that his best work was done. He spent his leisure time in antiquarian research and he published many works relating to the history of Harrow and of Pembrokeshire, and, in particular, of the Island of Caldey. For his research and literary work in connexion with the ecclesiastical architecture and antiquities of Pembrokeshire, he was awarded a Druids degree from the Welsh Gorsedd

29. Earl Grey, Albert Henry George Grey, fourth Earl, was born in 1851, and succeeded his uncle in the earldom in 1894. He was the son of General Charles Grey who had been Private

Secretary first to Prince Albert and then to Queen Victoria. He was educated at Harrow and Trinity, Cambridge. In 1878 he contested South Northumberland as a Liberal and was returned by two votes, but it was not until the General Election of 1880 that he became the member for South Northumberland, winning the seat by a large majority. In 1894 he was in South Africa when the Jameson Raid took place, and he was chosen to succeed Dr. Jameson as Administrator of Rhodesia, he kept this position until 1897 when he retired amidst the warm affection and admiration of the people of the territory. In 1898 he became a director of the Chartered Company, and held that appointment till 1904. In 1912 he paid his last visit to South Africa to unveil the memorial to Cecil Rhodes on the slopes of Table Mountain. The speech he made on that occasion was noted for its deep sincerity and insight. In 1904 Lord Grey succeeded Lord Minto as Governor-General of Canada. He had not held office long before it became clear that his qualities were exactly those which appealed to the Canadian people, and his great enthusiasm for Canada made him immediately and universally popular. His term of office was twice extended beyond the normal term, but on October 11, 1911, he sailed from Quebec amidst great demonstrations of appreciation from the people. On Lord Grey's return to England he again took interest in public work of the kind that appealed to him. He was most enthusiastic for agricultural reform, and it was gratifying to know that the importance of agriculture, and of agricultural co-operation was at last universally recognised. He also had the supreme satisfaction of knowing of the assembly of an Irish Convention, for which he had always hoped and worked. Lord Grey married, in 1877, Alice, daughter of Robert Stayner Holford. He leaves a son, Lord Howick, who succeeds him in the earldom, and two daughters.

29. His Excellency Señor Don Rafael Merry del Val, formerly Spanish Ambassador in Vienna and to the Holy See, and father of the Spanish

Ambassador in London, died at San Sebastian.

29 Prebendary Somerset Edward Pennefather was one of the best-known clergymen in London. He was born in Dublin in 1848, being the youngest son of Mr. John Pennefather, Q.C., and the grandson of Baron Pennefather, educated at King's College, London, and graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1871. He began his ministerial work as curate of East Claydon, Bucks, and he had experience for many years as vicar in North-country parishes and took a keen interest in all educational and social questions. The University of Aberdeen gave him an hon. D.D. in 1895, thus recognising his services to education in the North. When the important benefice of St. Mary Abbot's was vacated Prebendary Pennefather was appointed, and he proved himself to be a most capable chairman of committees, with great powers of organisation, and a zealous leader of Churchmen in Kensington. The Bishop of London appointed him a Prebendary of St Paul's Cathedral in 1907. For many years he was Rural Dean of Kensington. In 1909 he was elected Proctor for the Diocese of London and acted for the moderate High Churchmen, but he had the confidence of all parties. He also served as chaplain to the troops in Kensington Barracks and to the 4th Middlesex (West London Rifles).

— Sir Thomas Bland Royden, Bart., was in his 86th year. He was a member of the old Cheshire family, the Roydens of Frankby. Educated at Liverpool College he was apprenticed to his father's firm, Messrs. T. Royden & Sons, shipbuilders and shipowners. Shortly after coming of age he was admitted a partner, and for many years he was head of the firm and also of the India Steamship Company. He was High Sheriff of Cheshire in 1903-04 and two years later was created a baronet. He had been a magistrate of the city of Liverpool since 1874. Sir Thomas Royden was in 1885 returned to Parliament as a Conservative for the West Toxteth Division, and held the seat for seven years. The heir to the baronetcy is his eldest son.

SEPTEMBER.

1 Thomas Ansdeill Romer, Senior Master of the Court of Chancery, was in his 69th year. Mr. Romer was educated at Brighton, at Frankfort-on-the

Main, and in Paris. He was admitted a solicitor in 1873, having won a certificate of honour in the final examination. His writings on the law relating to

trustees and to copyright were widely used and appreciated.

1. The Duke Caetani di Sermoneta, Prince of Teano and of San Marco, was born in 1842, the eldest son of Duke Michelangelo Caetani di Sermoneta. Onorato Caetani early showed Italian patriotic tendencies and became prominent among the "White" aristocracy of Rome. Elected to the Chamber at an early age, he voted among the Moderate Conservatives, but obtained political prominence only in March, 1896, when he accepted the position of Foreign Minister in the Rudini Administration. His term of office was short, as he was held technically responsible for the famous Green book which Rudini issued, without having previously consulted the British Government upon the publication of sundry confidential dispatches.

2. Miss Agnes de Selincourt, Principal of Westfield College, in the University of London, was deeply interested in the Student Volunteer movement, and in the autumn of 1896 went out as a Missionary to India. She was first Principal of the Lady Muir Memorial College for Native Women at Allahabad, a post which she held for ten years; but in 1912 she was obliged to give up all work in India, and in the following year she was appointed Principal of Westfield College.

3. Boris Vladimirovitch Stuermer held office as Russian Prime Minister from January, 1916. He was born in 1848 and entered the office of the Public Prosecutor. Later on he directed the correspondence department in the Ministry of the Imperial Court for fourteen years, and in 1894 he was appointed Governor of Novgorod. In 1902 he was transferred to the Ministry of the Interior as Director-General. M. Stuermer was among the first persons of the old regime to be arrested during the Revolution, and since March, 1917, he had been a close prisoner, awaiting his trial.

4. Sir Frederick Low was in his 61st year, and was a son of the late Mr. Stephen Philpot Low. He was educated at Westminster and began his professional career as a solicitor. He was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple in 1890 and joined the South-Eastern Circuit. In 1902 he took silk, and his appointment as a Special Com-

missioner of Assize in 1912 gave a sure indication of his impending promotion to the Judicial Bench. In 1920 he was elected as Liberal Member for Norwich and held his seat until his appointment to the Bench in 1915. Mr. Justice Low married in 1882 and had one son and two daughters.

5. Arthur Robert Ingpen, K.C., was 60 years of age and educated at London University. He was called to the Bar in 1879 and practised on the Chancery side. In 1910 he took silk, and seven years later was made a Bencher of the Middle Temple. He compiled several legal works, and he will be remembered as the editor of "Master Worsley's Book on the History of the Middle Temple" and the author of the "Middle Temple Bench Book."

— **Professor Adolf von Baeyer** was in his 82nd year. Baeyer was one of the fathers of modern organic chemistry founded by the researches of himself and pupils trained under him. It was his work which helped in a marked degree to give Germany her high position in the chemical industry. His name is inseparably associated with the artificial production of indigo, his researches on which began in 1865. A pupil of Bunsen at Heidelberg, he spent some years at Berlin as a *Privatdozent*. In 1872 Baeyer was called to Strassburg as Professor of Chemistry and director of the new chemical laboratories in which many famous chemists studied. His stay there was short, and in 1875 he succeeded to Liebig's chair in Munich, where he built a new *Chemisches Institut*, in which two generations of organic chemists of all nationalities have received their training. Baeyer occupied a patriarchal position in the chemical world, and until his 80th birthday delivered lectures on five mornings each week.

7. William Henry Cousins, C.B., was born in 1838. He became secretary of the Inland Revenue Department, retiring after forty-three years in the Civil Service. He received the decoration of C.B. in recognition of his work in connexion with revenue and stamp reform.

9. Rear-Admiral Horatio Nelson Dudding entered the Navy in 1862 and obtained an Admiralty scholarship for general proficiency. As commander of H.M.S. *Dolphin* he received in 1892 the Medjidie of the 3rd class and the Khedive's bronze star in recognition

of distinguished services at the Battle of Tokar. He was thanked by the Brazilian Government for rescuing the whole crew of the Brazilian corvette *Alvorante Baixo* when that vessel was wrecked in the Red Sea in May, 1893. He was serving at Port Arthur during the crisis of 1898, and in the same year was present at the capture of Manila by Admiral Dewey. He retired with the rank of captain in 1902, and was promoted rear-admiral in 1905.

10. Percy Graham Westmacott was one of the notable engineers of the middle of the last century. He was in his 87th year. After serving with Miller, Ravenhill & Co., marine engineers, he joined Messrs. W. G. Armstrong & Co., Elswick, in 1851, becoming a partner in 1863 and managing director when the concern was turned into a limited liability company, remaining a director till 1913. He was a pioneer in the use of hydraulics, and he also collaborated throughout in the construction and development of the famous Armstrong gun. He was President of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers in 1883 and 1884, and only gave up his close association with engineering work in 1887 owing to ill-health. He was known in France and Belgium not only in connexion with harbour works and hydraulic plant but also in artistic circles, as a discerning collector of artists of the Brabazon school and of the Dutch school of the Maris brothers and Israels. He took an enthusiastic interest in the Volunteer movement in its early days, and raised and commanded for some years the 1st Newcastle-on-Tyne Engineer Volunteers.

11. Miss Evie Greene, the actress, was born at Portsmouth in 1876. When the vogue of musical comedy was at its height Evie Greene was one of its most successful and talented exponents, both in London and the country. She had a good voice and considerable talent as an actress. She made her first stage appearance in 1892. She played in "Paul Jones," "Maid Marian," "Morocco Bound," but she made her greatest success as Dolores in "Florodora." Other of her successes were Nan in "A Country Gul," Sans Gène in "The Duchess of Dantzic," and others. Her husband, Commander E. K. Arbuthnot, is on active service.

12. Queen Eleonore of Bulgaria was the elder daughter of Prince Henry IV. of Ruess-Kostritz and was

born in August, 1860. A portion of her early life was spent in Petrograd on visits to her relatives, the Grand Duke and Grand Duchess Vladimir Alexandrovitch. She took a great interest in sanitary science which led her to attend the hospitals, and after a course of study she received a certificate as a qualified nurse. During the Russo-Japanese War the Princess, as she was then, was able to put her knowledge to great use, she undertook the superintendence of a field ambulance, sharing all the risks and hardships of the campaign. In February, 1908, Princess Eleonore married, as his second wife, Prince Ferdinand. A great field of activity was now open to the Queen, and during the short period of its independent existence Bulgaria had made progress in all directions, but hygienic requirements had been much neglected. The task which presented itself to her as a sanitary reformer was a stupendous one, but she conquered all the difficulties, and her talent for organisation altered the condition of affairs. In the anxious days of the war with Turkey the Queen undertook the task of superintending and organising all the arrangements for the sick and wounded, and she often took a personal share in the hospital work. The second war brought with it a greater trouble, that of the menace of widespread famine, and the greatness of the Queen's character was shown in her unflagging energy and wonderful resource, so that the great crisis was skilfully dealt with. The memory of Queen Eleonore will live among the people of Bulgaria for all time.

13. Second-Lieut. Lord Basil Blackwood was killed in action, he was reported missing from July 3. He was born in 1870, the third son of the first Marquess of Dufferin, Governor-General in turn of Canada and of India, and Ambassador in Paris. Educated at Harrow and Balliol College, Oxford, he was intended for the Bar, to which he was called in 1896. But the law did not attract him, and for the last twenty years he led a life of great variety. At the outbreak of the Boer War he went at once to South Africa, first as a newspaper correspondent, then as Deputy Judge-Advocate to the Forces. On the occupation of the Republics in 1901 he joined Lord Milner's Staff in Johannesburg, became Assistant Colonial Secretary at Bloemfontein in 1903, and held that post for the next five years, sometimes acting as Colonial Secretary and

Deputy-Governor. In 1907 he was transferred as Colonial Secretary to Barbados and returned to London in 1909, first on the Staff of the Labour Exchanges, then as Assistant Secretary to the Development Commission. At the outbreak of the European War he enrolled as a member of the Intelligence Corps, and was attached to the 9th Lancers throughout the early fighting in Flanders, where he was soon severely wounded. During his convalescence in 1915 he went to Ireland as Private Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant and remained there till the collapse of the Irish Government after the Sinn Fein Rebellion. He was again free for the Army and obtained a commission in the Grenadier Guards in the summer of 1916, and after the usual period of training in London he went out to France where he was killed.

14. **Rear-Admiral Mather Byles** was 77 years of age. He entered the Navy in 1854, became captain in 1882, and retired in 1890, being promoted to flag rank seven years later. He served in the *Prince Regent* in the Baltic Expedition in 1854, was present in the *Exmouth* at the bombardment of Sveaborg, 1855, being awarded the Baltic medal. He also saw service as midshipman of the *Coromandel* during her many engagements with the Chinese, 1857, and subsequently served in the *Calcutta* during the bombardment of Canton, receiving the China medal with Canton clasp. He commanded the *Seagull* during the war in Egypt, 1882, and was awarded the Egyptian medal with clasp and the Khedive's Bronze Star, and promoted captain for his services on the occasion.

17. **Major - General Mathew-Lannowe**, late R.E., was in his 83rd year, the eldest son of the late Sir George B. Buckley-Mathew, K.C.M.G., C.B. Major-General Mathew-Lannowe joined the R.E. in 1855 after a brilliant career at Addiscombe. He went to India immediately after obtaining his commission, to join the Old East India Company in the Bombay Presidency. He served almost entirely in this Presidency, including a term at Aden. He was responsible for the relief works of the great famine in Southern India during 1876-77 and received special mention for his services. He retired in 1886 with the rank of major-general and at that time assumed the additional surname of Lannowe.

17. **Edwin Waterhouse**, lately head of the firm Price, Waterhouse & Co., chartered accountants. Born in 1841 he was educated at University College, London, and began practice as a public accountant in 1864. From 1892 to 1894 he was President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales. He was auditor of the London & North-Western Railway and also to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster and to the University of Oxford, and it was in recognition of his great services as auditor that the University authorities conferred on him the degree of M.A., *honoris causa*. In 1908 he was made a magistrate for the county of Surrey.

18. **Charles Vandeleur Creagh, C.M.G.**, was born in 1842 and educated at the Royal Naval School, New Cross, and Eastman's, Southsea, and was a barrister of the Middle Temple. It was in the far East, however, that his life's work was done, and he had a distinguished career. In 1866, when Assistant District Superintendent of the Punjab Police, he was selected to raise and organise the Sikh Police Force for the Hong-Kong Government, and for the next sixteen years he served in the Colony in magisterial and other appointments. He received the thanks of the Government for his services during the typhoon of 1874, and in 1883 he was selected for the post of Assistant British Resident Judge of the Residency Court, and Member of the State Council at Perak. Five years later he was appointed Governor and Chief Judicial Officer of British North Borneo and later Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Labuan, which post he held until his retirement in 1895. He was made a C.M.G. in 1892.

20. **Sir Edward Hain** was 65 years of age. He was the eldest son of the late Mr. Edward Hain, of St. Ives, his family having been connected with the shipping and fisheries of that port for centuries. Until the Home Rule split Sir Edward Hain was a supporter of Mr. Gladstone. From 1900 to 1906 he sat as the Liberal-Unionist member for the St. Ives Division of Cornwall. In 1910-11 he was President of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, and in the following year was Sheriff of Cornwall. He was six times Mayor of St. Ives, and for twenty years a member of its town council. In 1910 he received a knighthood.

21. **John Richard Blakiston** was born in 1829, son of a famous physician

of the day, Dr. Peyton Blakiston, M.D., F.R.S. In 1849 he took a scholarship at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1852 became second classic. On leaving Cambridge, instead of taking his Fellowship, he took a second mastership at Uppingham under Dr. Thring. He subsequently was appointed head master of Preston Grammar School and in 1860 head master of Giggleswick. In 1868 Mr Blakiston gave up teaching and became H.M. Inspector of Schools for Leicestershire, and in 1882 was appointed Chief Inspector for the northwest of England and Inspector of the Sheffield district. He was the author of "The Teacher," "Glimpses of the Globe," and other books on education. He retired in 1894, and was well known as a great reformer in educational matters.

22 **Rear - Admiral Leicester Chantrey Keppel** was 80 years of age. As a midshipman in H.M.S. *Bellerophon* he served in the Russian War, 1854-55, in the Baltic and Crimea. In later years he was engaged in the suppression of the slave trade on the East Coast of Africa; served in the expedition up the Zambezi with Dr. Livingstone, and was in command of the gunboats *Janus* and *Insolent* at Chefoo, 1867-69. For his action in obtaining redress for outrages on British subjects at Jamone, Formosa, in 1868 he was thanked by the Commander-in-Chief, and in 1877 he was mentioned in dispatches as commander of the *Avon* in the Niger Expedition, when several piratical villages were destroyed and severe punishment inflicted on river pirates. He commanded H.M. ships *Constance* and *Cleopatra* in China and Japan, and afterwards became flag-captain to the Commander-in-Chief at the Nore.

— **Rufus Daniel Pullar**, senior partner in the well-known firm of Messrs. J. Pullar & Sons, dyers and cleaners of Perth, was the elder son of the late Sir Robert Pullar, and was born in Perth in 1861. At Edinburgh University he devoted special attention to chemistry, and took a course of study in the Department of Science and Technology at the University of Leeds. He then returned to Perth and became head of the firm on the death of his father in 1912. He was a life Fellow of the Chemical Society of London and a member of the British Association, and visited Canada and the United States as a member of that Association. Mr. Pullar was most interested in scientific pursuits.

22. **Sir Edward Wood** was 78 years of age, and was for many years head of Messrs. Freeman, Hardy, & Willis, boot manufacturers. He was four times Mayor of Leicester, and raised 100,000/- for rebuilding local infirmaries.

23 **Brigadier-General Francis Aylmer Maxwell, V.C., C.S.I., D.S.O.**, was born in 1871. He entered the Army in 1891, obtaining his first appointment in the Royal Sussex Regiment. Two years later he transferred to the Indian Army, being appointed to the 18th Lancers. While in India he served on the Staff of Lord Kitchener. He received the D.S.O. for his services with the Tirah Expedition of 1897-98. General Maxwell also served on the Staff in the South African War, was mentioned twice in dispatches and given the brevet of major. It was during this campaign that he won the V.C. In 1910 he was appointed Military Secretary to Lord Hardinge, Viceroy of India. During the European War he commanded a battalion of the Middlesex Regiment, and in 1916 was awarded a bar to the D.S.O. He was appointed to the command of a brigade in October, 1916, and was killed in action.

— **Walter E. Archer, C.B., F.R.S.E.**, formerly assistant secretary of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, was born in 1855. In 1884 Mr. Archer acquired the fishing rights of Sands River, Norway, and he then began his researches into the life history of the salmon, and as the result of his knowledge he was appointed in 1892 as Inspector of Salmon Fisheries for Scotland. He left Scotland in 1898 to take up the appointment of Chief Inspector of Fisheries for England and Wales, and subsequently that of assistant secretary to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, which position he held from 1903 to 1912. He acted as British delegate at many international conferences, and in 1908 became President of the International Council charged with the exploration of the North Sea. In 1912 he retired after twenty years' research into the development of the fresh water and sea fisheries of the country.

— **Frano Supilo**, the Croatian Deputy, died in London. At the outbreak of the European War M. Supilo was in Switzerland, and so escaped the fate of his friends, who were all imprisoned or executed by the Austro-Hungarian authorities. He came to

England and was instrumental in organising the Southern Slav Committee and in working for the cause of Southern Slav unity. M. Supilo will be remembered as the leader of the Serbo-Croatian Coalition which prosecuted Dr. Friedjung, the Austrian historian, in the great trial in 1909 for false accusations of treason. The "documents" which the historian had used were afterwards proved to have been forgeries.

25. The Earl of Mount-Edgecumbe. William Henry, fourth Earl of Mount-Edgecumbe, was the son of the third Earl. Born in 1832 he was educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford. On leaving the University he at once entered into public affairs, and at the General Election in April, 1859, he was returned, as Viscount Valletort, for Plymouth as a Conservative. In the autumn of 1861 he succeeded his father in the peerage. He held various offices at Court from time to time. In 1866 he was appointed an Extra Lord of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales, whom he accompanied on his foreign travels. In 1879 Lord Mount-Edgecumbe was appointed Lord Chamberlain of the Household. He was Lord High Steward of Her Majesty's Household from 1885 to 1892, and was also an aide-de-camp to Queen Victoria. In 1901 he was appointed as the head of the special mission which conveyed to the rulers of Belgium, the Netherlands, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and Italy the official announcement of the death of Queen Victoria and the accession of King Edward. In the counties of Devon and Cornwall the late Earl took a prominent place. He was Lord-Lieutenant of Cornwall and the first chairman of the County Council, he was also a Deputy-Lieutenant for Devon and Special Deputy-Warden of the Stannaries. In 1897 Queen Victoria appointed him to be the Vice-Admiral of Cornwall. Lord Mount-Edgecumbe took great interest in the Volunteer movement, and became brigadier-general of the Plymouth Volunteer Brigade. He also took a great interest in Church matters, and warmly supported the scheme for the division of the Diocese of Exeter and the restoration to Cornwall of a see of its own. In 1858 he married Lady Katherine Elizabeth Hamilton, daughter of James, first Duke of Abercorn. She died in 1874, leaving a son and three daughters. Piers Alexander Hamilton,

Viscount Valletort, who succeeds to the earldom, was born in 1865.

25. Sir John R. Roberts was in his 84th year. He was a member of the Essex County Council, the West Ham Town Council, the Framework Knitters' Company, a life governor of the Cancer Hospital, and one of the Essex Sewer Commissioners. The freedom of the City of London was conferred upon him.

27 The Rev. Henry George Bonavia Hunt, Mus.D., F.R.S.E., Vicar of Burgess Hill, was 70 years of age. He was formerly sub-editor and editor of the *Quiver* (1865-1905), editor of *Cassell's Magazine* (1874-96), and editor and founder of *Little Folks* from its commencement to 1876. He was the founder and first Warden of Trinity College, London (1872-92), and teacher of musical history at the University of London from 1900 to 1907. He took his degree as Mus B. at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1876, and that of Mus D. at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1887. He was ordained in 1878.

28 Hon. the Rev. John Horatio Nelson, second son of the second Earl Nelson, was in his 93rd year. He took his M.A. degree at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1846, and was ordained in the following year—seventy years ago. His last appointment was to the rectory of Shaw with Donnington, Newbury, where he remained from 1872 until 1909. In 1857 he married Susan, eldest daughter of Lord Charles Spencer-Churchill.

30 Charles Napier Hemy, R.A., the well-known marine painter, was the son of Henri F. Hemy, the musician, and was in his 77th year. It was not until he was 22 that he decided to become a painter, and when he was 24 he exhibited his first picture at the Royal Academy. Afterwards he went to Antwerp and studied under Baron Henri Leys. He returned to England in 1870, lived in London until 1881, and then went to Falmouth, where most of his pictures have since been painted. He was elected A.R.A. in 1898 and R.A. in 1910. Many of his pictures are well known to the public in various galleries. Mr. Napier Hemy's interest was not altogether in the sea landscape, but it was the struggle of men with the sea that his pictures always represented.

OCTOBER.

2. **Bernard Arkwright**, head of the engine works department of Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Newcastle, was born in 1861, the son of the late Rev. George Arkwright. Educated at Harrow, he went to Elswick as an apprentice to the private firm of Sir W. G. Armstrong & Co. In 1888 he became assistant manager of the engine works, and in 1902 was promoted to be the principal. In 1912 he was made a local director of the company. Mr Arkwright held a prominent position in the North-East Coast Engineer Employers' Federation, and was a member of important committees and conciliation boards.

4 **Admiral Sir Frederick Tower Hamilton, M.V.O., K.C.B.**; Commander-in-Chief on the coast of Scotland, was the second son of Captain Henry George Hamilton, R.N. Born in 1856, he entered the Royal Navy as a cadet on board the *Britannia* in August, 1869, and was promoted to Sub-Lieutenant in June, 1875. Four years later he took part in active service during the Zulu War, being mentioned in dispatches for his services and promoted to Lieutenant. As a Lieutenant he specialised in the torpedo branch, and after qualifying was appointed a Staff Officer of the Torpedo Schoolship *Vernon* in 1884. In August, 1891, he was chosen by the Commander-in-Chief at Portsmouth, Admiral the Earl of Clanwilliam, to supervise the arrangements made for the accommodation of the Press representatives during the visit of the French Fleet to Portsmouth. He was promoted Commander in 1892 and Captain in 1898. In 1902 he took up the post of Flag-Captain to the Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean, and when King Edward visited Malta in the following March he awarded Captain Hamilton the M.V.O. In 1905 he became Commodore in command of the Gunnery School of the Navy at Whale Island, Portsmouth. On relinquishing this command in 1907 he was appointed to the post of Inspector of Target Practice. In October, 1907, he was advanced to flag rank. Resuming service in February, 1909, Admiral Hamilton hoisted his flag in command of the Fifth Cruiser Squadron, Atlantic Fleet. In 1912 he was promoted to the rank of Vice-Admiral in command of the Third and Fourth Divisions of the Home Fleet. While in this command he was

awarded the K.C.B. in the New Year Honours of 1913. At the beginning of the European War Sir Frederick Hamilton was Second Sea Lord of the Admiralty. He remained at Whitehall until July, 1916, when he hoisted his flag at Rosyth as Commander-in-Chief on the coast of Scotland, where he was serving at the time of his death. Sir Frederick married, in 1889, Maria, daughter of Admiral of the Fleet the Hon. Sir Harry Keppel, and had issue two sons and two daughters.

5 **Major Claude Arthur Askew and Mrs. Askew**, the novelists, were drowned in the Mediterranean, their vessel was attacked by a submarine. Major and Mrs. Askew had written, always in collaboration, a large number of popular novels and serial stories. Their first book, "The Shulamite," was written in 1904, and was dramatised and produced at the Savoy Theatre two years afterwards. They were married in 1900, Mrs. Askew being the daughter of Colonel Henry Leake, of the 44th and 70th Regiments. Both were in Serbia during the European War, and their book "The Stricken Land" is a vivid account of the hardships which they shared with the Serbian Army on its retreat from Prishtina to Alessio.

— **Sir George Heynes Radford**, Liberal M.P. for East Islington since 1906, was 66 years of age. He represented West Islington on the London County Council from 1895 to 1907. In 1872 he was admitted a Solicitor, was a Magistrate for Surrey, and was knighted in 1916. Sir George was associated with Mr. Birrell in the issue of "Obiter Dicta," and he wrote the essay on "Falstaff" in the first series, although his name did not appear at the time.

— **Professor Charles Wells** had been Oriental translator to the Foreign Office since 1892. In 1870-74 he was Professor of English at the Imperial Naval College, Constantinople. Formerly Lecturer on Turkish at Oxford, he was Professor of Turkish in King's College, London, from 1889 to 1916. He published many books on Turkish grammar and literature. He was 79 years of age.

— **Hon. Alexander Bruce**, the third son of the late Earl of Elgin, was 33 years of age and had held the

N

position of Assistant District Commissioner in the East Africa Protectorate since 1908. He was accidentally killed.

8. Sir Edward Letchworth, a prominent Freemason, was born in 1853. In 1876 he was initiated in the Jerusalem Lodge. In 1901 the Prince of Wales (afterwards King Edward VII.), who was Grand Master of the Craft, appointed Edward Letchworth to be the Grand Secretary, and in 1902, after his accession to the throne, he conferred on him the honour of knighthood. It was as Consecrating Officer that Sir Edward Letchworth was best known to members of the Masonic Order. Sir Edward was one of the original supporters of the Volunteer movement at its inception in 1859, and for seven years held a commission as Captain in two of the Volunteer Corps. He was a Governor of the Foundling Hospital, as well as of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. He was also a Vice-President of the Royal Masonic Benevolent Institution, Vice-Patron of the Royal Masonic Institution for Boys, and Patron of the Royal Masonic Institution for Girls, on whose House Committee he had served for forty years.

9. Hussein Kamel, first Sultan of Egypt, the second son of Ismail Pasha, was born at Cairo on December, 20, 1853. After attending the schools founded in Egypt by his illustrious ancestor, Mohamed Ali, he was sent in 1867 to complete his education in Paris, where he became the guest of Napoleon III. He left Paris just before the siege. From 1872-78 he held the highest Ministerial posts in the country, and gained an experience which was of immense value to him in after life. When Ismail was deposed, his favourite son went with him into exile, and remained with him at Naples until after the Arabic affair, when Hussein received permission to return to Egypt. He at once resumed his great interest in the affairs of the country, was a keen agriculturist and a firm believer in the benefits of education, and was always ready to give support to any proposal for the improvement of the lot of the Egyptian fellah. In January, 1909, he accepted the Presidency of the Legislative Council and General Assembly, but he unfortunately held the post for only a year, resigning in March, 1910. Prince Hussein was always a valued friend of the British administrators, who recognised the extreme value of his sound and disinterested counsel.

In the autumn of 1914, when it became clear that the Khedive, Abbas Hilmi, had definitely cast in his lot with the Turks, his immediate deposition became imperative. And it was with perfect unanimity of native and European opinion that Hussein Kamel ascended the Throne as the first Sultan of Egypt in December, 1914. The Sultan accepted his new dignity, knowing all the dangers and difficulties that awaited him, and the fact that he had accepted the Throne at the hands of the British Government was bound to be misunderstood in certain native circles, and to cost him much of his previous popularity. In 1915 two determined attempts were made to assassinate him, but he treated these attempts with courage and disdain. His life was a continual round of public duties, he was a fluent and forcible speaker, and the natives always flocked in thousands to hear him; he was thus constantly influencing native opinion in the right direction, and towards the later part of his reign his earlier unpopularity had given place to a feeling in the opposite direction. He was endowed with great charm of manner and consummate tact, and had all the qualities that go to make a successful Oriental ruler.

10. Sir Edward Evans, one of the best-known business men in Liverpool, was 71 years of age. For a very long period he was an active politician, and carried out much organisation work for the Liberals in West Cheshire. He helped to found the Liverpool Federal Council, and in 1888 became chairman of that body. In 1890 he became elected to the Committee of the National Liberal Federation; and four years later chairman, a position he held for twelve years. He was Justice of the Peace in 1894 and was knighted in 1906.

13. Colonel Sir Edward Thomas Davenant Cotton-Jodrell, K.C.B., was in his 71st year. He was the son of G. E. L. Cotton, late Bishop of Calcutta, and assumed the name of Jodrell in 1890. Educated at Rugby and Marlborough in 1868 he passed first in Artillery commissions from Woolwich. In the same year he entered the Royal Artillery, retiring in 1881. He was afterwards Hon. Colonel of the 2nd Cheshire R.E. (Railway Battalion) Territorials. He sat as Conservative M.P. for the Wirral Division of Cheshire from 1885 to 1900. He was appointed Deputy Assistant-Director of the Headquarters Staff in

1906, and held that post for six years, being created C.B. in 1902 and K.C.B. in 1911. Sir Edward Cotton Jodrell married, in 1878, Mary, daughter of W. R. Colenidge, Salston, Ottery St. Mary, by whom he had two daughters.

13. **Miss Mary Gurney** was 81 years of age, and was one of the pioneers of the movement for the improvement of the education of women. She helped to establish the National Union, which developed into the Girls' Public Day School Company, now the Trust. During the forty-five years' existence of the Trust, Miss Mary Gurney was a member of the Council, and her wise counsels, her zeal, her high culture and noble sympathies helped in no small measure its direction. She took part in the direction of Gutzon College, Cheltenham Ladies' College, Princess Helena College, and other institutions, and also in the beginnings of the Victoria League.

17. **Sir William Pollard Byles**, M.P. for North Salford, was born in 1839, and educated at a private school and succeeded his father in the control of the *Yorkshire Observer*, of which he was the founder. In 1892 he entered Parliament as member for the Shipley Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire, but was defeated in 1895. He took in succeeding years a strong anti-war line. He remained out of Parliament until 1906, when he was elected Liberal member for Salford. He was knighted in 1911. Sir William Byles championed one unpopular cause after another, and was a leading figure in many hostile Parliamentary incidents. His attendance was constant at the House of Commons, but during the last three years the House had heard little of him.

— **Sir John Prichard Jones, Bart.**, principal of the firm of Messrs. Dickens & Jones, drapers, of Regent Street, was 72 years of age, and began life as a draper's assistant in Bangor. In 1914 he retired from business, and since that time he had taken a keen and active interest in Welsh educational work. He was created a baronet in 1910, and is succeeded by his son, born in 1913.

18. **Joseph Hoult**, the well-known shipowner, born in 1847, was apprenticed to a firm of shipbrokers in Liverpool, and at the age of 21 years began business on his own account as a shipbroker. He established the firm Joseph Hoult & Co., steamship owners

of Liverpool, and built up a very prosperous business. For a few years Mr. Hoult was a member of the Liverpool City Council. He sat as a Conservative member of Parliament for Wirral, Cheshire, from 1900 to 1906.

18. **Dr. Edward Hull, F.R.S.**, was born in 1829. In 1850, having graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, and gained the Diploma of Civil Engineering, he was appointed to the staff of the Geological Survey of Great Britain, and seventeen years later became a district surveyor to the Survey of Scotland. In 1869 he was appointed Director of the Geological Survey of Ireland and Professor of Geology in the Royal College of Science, Dublin. He retired from public service on the completion of the Irish Survey in 1890. Professor Hull was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1867, and in 1879 he received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of Glasgow.

20. **Dr. Robert Braithwaite** was born in 1824. He entered the medical profession and became an M.R.C.S. Eng. in 1858 and an M.D. of St. Andrews in 1865. As a Fellow of the Linnean Society and of the Royal Microscopical Society, he devoted his time to the study of the flora and fauna of Europe and America. In 1878 he published "The Sphagnaceæ, or Peat Mosses of Europe and North America," and between 1880 and 1905 "The British Moss Flora." He retired from medical practice in 1899.

— **Sir James Whitehead, Bart.**, a former Lord Mayor of London, was born in 1834. He was for many years a commercial traveller, and then a merchant in the City. In 1882 he was elected Alderman of Cheap Ward, and served the office of Sheriff in 1884-85. In 1888-89 he was Lord Mayor and had an interesting and brilliant Mayoralty. In 1892 he entered Parliament as a Liberal and represented Leicester until 1894, when a breakdown in health forced him to retire. At the close of his Mayoralty he was created a baronet. He married in 1860, and is succeeded in the baronetcy by his eldest son.

24. **Sir William James Herschel, Bart.**, the author of the finger print identity system, was born in 1833, and was a grandson of the famous discoverer of Uranus and the son of the eminent astronomer and chemist, Sir John Frederick Herschel, first baronet. Sir William graduated M.A. at Oxford,

and after passing through Haileybury in 1853 he received a nomination to the Indian Civil Service and went out to Bengal. He served for many years in the Hooghly district, and it was there in 1859 that he applied the first tests of the practicability of using finger-print impressions as a means of identification. Although at first his work went unrecognised he had the satisfaction in later years of seeing his methods applied in all parts of the world. On retirement from India Sir William settled down in Oxford and served for some time as a member of the Oxfordshire County Council. He married in 1864, and two sons and a daughter were born. He is succeeded in the baronetcy by his eldest son, the Rev. John Charles William Heischel, F.R.A.S., who was born in 1869.

24. **William Hole, R.S.A.**, a noted figure in the Scottish art world, was 70 years of age. Although of English descent his life was spent in Edinburgh. He was educated at the Edinburgh Academy and began life as a civil engineer, but his natural love for art led him to attend the drawing schools and life classes. He possessed a great historical imagination, and his pictures "The Struggle of the '45" and "The End of the '45" show his talent in this direction. "News of Flodden," painted in 1888, is one of his best-known works. In 1889 his full membership of the Royal Scottish Academy was achieved, and from 1892 he gave much of his time to mural painting. His work as an etcher and book illustrator is well known.

— **Sir Charles Pardey Lukis, K.C.S.I., M.D. London, F.R.C.S. England**, Director-General of Indian Medical Services, was 60 years of age. He received his professional education at St. Bartholomew's Hospital and entered the Indian Medical Service in 1830. Transferred to the Civil branch, he held various appointments in the United Provinces and became Civil Surgeon of Simla in 1899, being later made Honorary Surgeon to the Viceroy. In 1905 he was appointed Principal and Professor of Medicine in the Calcutta Medical College and First Physician of the College Hospital. In 1910 he was selected to be Director-General, and held the highest medical administrative post in India for a period of nearly eight years. He edited a journal devoted to original research in medicine in India, and was the author of "A Manual of Tropical Hygiene."

26. **Charles Francis Keary**, the novelist, was 69 years of age. He was educated at Marlborough and Trinity College, Cambridge, and was for some years in the Department of Coins at the British Museum. In 1890 he published "The Vikings in Western Christendom," still a standard book on the subject. In middle life he left his historical writing and turned to *belles lettres*. His first novel, "A Marriage de Convenance," was published in 1889, and was followed by a series of other novels. These never had a very large circulation, but they were highly thought of amongst literary people. Besides his novels two little books stand out for their beauty and charm, one "The Wanderer" (1888), published under the pseudonym H. Ogram Matuce, perhaps the most perfect of Keary's prose works, and the other is a series of short sketches, "Twixt Dog and Wolf" (1901), and is beautifully done. In 1911 he published a work of philosophy, "The Pursuit of Reason," in which he sought to give a general statement of his philosophy of life, including his view of religion.

27. **The Marchioness of Ripon** was Constance Gwendolyn, daughter of the first Lord Herbert of Lea. She was twice married, her first husband being the fourth Earl of Lonsdale. It was in 1885 that she married the present Marchioness of Ripon.

— **Worthington George Smith, F.L.S.**, was 82 years of age. He was an Antiquary and Geologist of repute, and author of several works, including "Man, the Primeval Savage." Mr. Smith was the discoverer and translator of the Charter granted to Dunstable by King Henry I. He was the first freeman of the borough of Dunstable, and wrote a history of the town.

28. **Prince Frederic Christian Charles Augustus of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, K.G., P.C.**, was the husband of Her Royal Highness Princess Helena, the third daughter of Queen Victoria. He was born on January 22, 1831, at Augustenburg, his father's home on the Isle of Als. His father was Duke Christian August, and he it was who in 1848 placed himself at the head of his adherents to resist by force the claims of Denmark upon the Duchies. Prince Christian, who was only 17 years of age at this time, at once entered the newly constituted

Schleswig-Holstein Army, and took part in several engagements, in which his House, supported by the people of the Duchies, tried to defend their cause. The House of Augustenburg was not successful, and being defeated at the battle of Idstedt, the Duke with his family had to find a new home. Meanwhile Prince Christian and his brother went to the University of Bonn, and a deep friendship was formed with Prince Frederic of Prussia, afterwards the Emperor Frederic. During the vacations the princes travelled a great deal and became acquainted with the various States of the German Confederation, and with foreign countries and their rulers. With the death of King Frederic VII. of Denmark in November, 1863, the Schleswig-Holstein question once more became acute. Bismarck had always had the idea of the annexation of the Duchies, and at King William's final assent to Bismarck's policy the active military career in Germany of Prince Christian closed. In the year 1865 Prince Christian visited England, and his betrothal to Princess Helena took place at Windsor. On July 5 in the following year, two days after the fate of the Duchies had been sealed, his marriage with the Princess Helena took place in the private Chapel of Windsor Castle. The marriage was the beginning of many years of happiness, and the Prince, who had always had a strong regard for England and its constitutional form of government, was able to enjoy the pleasures of an English country gentleman's life. His skill with gun and rifle was very great, in spite of the loss, in later years, of one eye. In October, 1900, Prince Christian suffered a deep loss in the death of his eldest son, Prince Christian Victor, who died at Pretoria in the service of his adopted country. Prince Christian was a Knight of the Garter, a member of the Privy Council, a personal aide-de-camp to the Sovereign, a General in the British Army, Ranger of Windsor Park, and High Steward of Windsor, and Honorary D.C.L of Oxford University. His two daughters now bear the titles of Princess Helena Victoria and Princess Marie Louise, their territorial name of Schleswig-Holstein having been dropped by Royal Warrant in 1917.

28. **Mrs. James George Hutchinson**, known in the theatrical world as Miss Emma Hutchinson, was one of the oldest theatrical managers in England. She began her career in management in 1888.

28. **Brigadier-General Cecil Rawling, C.M.G., C.I.E.**, was killed in action in France. He was born in 1870 and educated at Clifton College, and received his first commission in the Somerset Light Infantry. He went almost at once to India and first saw active service in the North-West Frontier campaign of 1897-98, for which he received the medal and clasp, after that he took to surveying work on the Tibetan border. He explored the northern slopes of the Himalayas and had the distinction of determining the source of the Bramaputria river. For these discoveries he received the thanks of the Indian Government and the C.I.E., and a record of his travels is to be found in his book, "The Great Plateau". The outbreak of the European War put a stop to further exploration, and in the spring of 1915 he took his battalion to France and went through the fighting at Hooge, and the long winter that followed in the Ypres salient. He received a brigade and a C.M.G. just before the Somme. In June, 1917, he was awarded the gold medal of the Royal Geographical Society for his exploring work, which gave him intense satisfaction. All the summer of 1917 he was constantly engaged, first in the fighting in the Hindenburg line, and then in the great battle east of Ypres.

30. **Earl of Londesborough**, William Francis Henry Denison, second Earl of Londesborough, was born in 1864, and was the only son of the first Earl, whom he succeeded in the title in 1900. His mother was the youngest daughter of the seventh Duke of Beaufort. Lord Londesborough was a Deputy Lieutenant for the East Riding of Yorkshire, and was formerly a Lieutenant in the Yorkshire Hussars, and Honorary Colonel of the 2nd V B East Yorkshire Regiment, and at the time of his death he held the Honorary Colonely of the 5th (Cyclist) Battalion of the same regiment. In 1887 he married Lady Giace Augusta Fane, elder daughter of the 12th Earl of Westmorland, and he leaves a family of two sons and a daughter. He is succeeded by his elder son Viscount Raincliffe, who was born in 1892.

— **Major Talbot Mercer Papineau, M.C.**, Canadian Infantry, was killed in action. He was born at Montreal in 1883, and was the great-grandson of Louis Joseph Papineau, the leader of the French Canadian Rebellion of 1837, and on his mother's

side was descended from one of the signatories to the American Declaration of Independence. He was educated at McGill University, Montreal, and at Brasenose College, Oxford, where he was one of the first Rhodes Scholars. In 1908 he took his degree with Honours in Jurisprudence, and on returning to Canada the next year he was called to the Bar, and continued to practice until July, 1914. On the

outbreak of the European War, he immediately offered himself for service, and obtained a commission in the Canadian Infantry. He went to the front in January, 1915, where he remained almost continuously until his death. In March, 1915, he was awarded the Military Cross, his conduct being specially mentioned in Lord French's second dispatch.

NOVEMBER.

1. The Very Rev. Philip Frank Eliot, K.C.V.O., Dean of Windsor, was born in 1835, the son of the late Mr. William Eliot, J.P., D.L. He was educated at Bath Grammar School and won an exhibition at Trinity College, Oxford. In 1858 he was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Winchester, and in 1860 he received priest's orders from the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1867 Mr. Eliot accepted the newly constituted vicarage of Holy Trinity, and for twenty-three years he carried on a most successful work there. In 1881 Bishop Harold Browne nominated him to an Honorary Canonry in Winchester Cathedral. In 1886 Canon Eliot received from the Crown a Residential Canonry of Windsor, and in 1891 the Deanery of Windsor was conferred on him and he therefore left Bournemouth. He was at once appointed Domestic Chaplain to the Queen and was reappointed by King Edward and by King George. In 1904 Dean Eliot was elected Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, but was obliged to resign in 1912 owing to medical advice. The late Dean was twice married.

2. Lord Abercromby of Aboukir and Tullibody. George Ralph Campbell Abercromby, the fourth Baron, was born in 1838 and succeeded his father in 1852. In 1858 he married Lady Julia Janet Georgiana, a sister of the present Lord Camperdown, and Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Victoria, 1874-85. He is succeeded in the title by his brother, the Hon. John Abercromby.

— Lieutenant-Colonel W. A. Ellison, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., M.D., the son of the late James Ellison, M.D., was born in 1855, and educated at Eton and University College, Oxford. While at Eton he rowed in the college eight in 1873-74, and at Oxford he continued his successful career as oarsman, and in 1878 he

secured the bow seat in the University crew which beat Cambridge at Putney. Colonel Ellison decided to follow his father's profession, and went as a student to St George's Hospital, and became M.R.C.S. in 1882 and L.R.C.P. two years later, and took his M.D. degree at Oxford in 1895. He was Surgeon-Apothecary to the Household at Windsor Castle, Consulting Surgeon to King Edward VII. Hospital at Windsor, Surgeon to Windsor Royal Infirmary, Assistant Medical Registrar at St George's, and a member of the Eton College Medical Board.

2. The Very Rev. Henry Donald Maurice Spence-Jones, D.D., Dean of Gloucester, who was in his 82nd year, was a son of Mr. George Spence, Q.C., M.P. He added to his surname the name of Jones after his marriage, in 1871, to Miss Louise Jones, daughter and heiress of Mr. David Jones of Pantglas, M.P. for Carmarthenshire. He went to Westminster School, and after spending two years as secretary to Sir Douglas Galton, at the Board of Trade, he went to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and in 1865 took his degree with a first class in Theology and won the Caius and Scholefield University Prizes for graduates. On leaving Cambridge Dr Spence-Jones was ordained and at once took up work at St David's College, Lampeter, as Professor of English Literature and Modern Languages. In 1877 the Crown appointed him to the vicarage at St Pancras, and he attracted large congregations by his interesting and forceful preaching. In 1886 he was appointed to the Deanery of Gloucester, and this position suited his tastes and interests admirably. He knew the city and diocese well, for he had remained one of Dr. Ellicott's examining chaplains, and he had been an Honorary Canon of the Cathedral for years. Dr. Spence-Jones was widely known as a writer of various works on Church History, the most successful

being on early Christianity. His "Early Christianity and Paganism: a History, of A.D. 64-320" gives a very vivid and picturesque account of the early days of the Christian faith. Dr Spence-Jones was Chaplain of the Order of St John of Jerusalem, and Professor of Ancient History in the Royal Academy.

3 **Dr. Thomas Tillyer Whigham** was 78 years of age. He was educated at Rugby and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated as M.D. in 1888. He had a long association with St. George's Hospital, holding the posts of Demonstrator in Anatomy, Curator of Museum, Lecturer on Botany, Pathology, and Medicine, Assistant Physician and Physician. He was Examiner in Medicine for Oxford University, and for the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons in England, and Censor and Senior Censor of the Royal College of Physicians. He often wrote in the *Lancet* and in other medical journals.

4 **William Du Bois Duddell, C.B.E., F.R.S.**, Consulting Engineer, was 45 years of age. He had been President of the Rontgen Society and the Institution of Electrical Engineers, and for some months had been a member of the Admiralty Board of Invention and Research, and also of the Inventions Board of the Ministry of Munitions. In 1912 Mr. Duddell received the Hughes Medal of the Royal Society.

— **Sir David Caldwell McVail** was in his 72nd year, and was closely identified for many years with Scottish University reform. In 1866 he qualified as Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, and ten years later he graduated as M.B. at Glasgow University. Although he had a very large private practice in Glasgow he found time for other professional work of a public character. He was an honorary Consulting Physician of the Glasgow Royal Infirmary, and an Assistant Physician of the Western Infirmary. He taught Physiology in Anderson's College, and was Professor of Clinical Medicine in St Mungo's College from 1889 to 1906. Sir David was for many years a member of the Glasgow University Court, Crown member for Scotland of the General Medical Council until 1912; and the author of many publications on physiological subjects, specialising in diseases of the heart and lungs. In 1910 he received his knighthood.

5 **Thomas Edward Kebbel**, the journalist and author, was in his 91st year. He was educated at Merchant Taylor's School, where he was a boarder, and at Oxford, first at Exeter College and afterwards at Lincoln, where he was an exhibitioner, and graduated with a second in "Greats" in 1849. In 1862 he was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple, and for many years he held the office of Receiver of Fines for the Treasury, but journalism was his profession, and in 1873 he joined the *Standard*, on the staff of which he continued as a political leader writer for many years. He was on terms of confidential friendship with Disraeli, to whom he was introduced in 1858. From that time onwards he saw a great deal of him, and it was to Disraeli that he owed much of his training in politics. Mr Kebbel did a great deal of biographical and historical work, including lives of Beaconsfield, Lord Derby, and Crabbe, a collection of Beaconsfield's speeches, "Essays on History and Politics," and history of "Tory Administrations." In 1911 he published an interesting volume of recollections, "The Battle of Life," a record chiefly of his early struggles.

7. **W. H. Kendal**, the well-known actor, whose paternal name was Grimston, was born in 1843, and went on the stage at the age of 18. In 1866 he became leading juvenile in Buckstone's Company at the Haymarket, and remained there until 1874. In 1863 he married Madge Robertson, the sister of T. W. Robertson, the dramatist; and after 1875 Mr and Mrs. Kendal consistently acted together. In 1879 he began his joint management of the St. James's Theatre with Sir John Hare, which lasted until 1888. Some of his best work was done at this period, and he added many more parts to a very long list. Dr. Thornton in "Peril," and Julian Beauclerc in "Diplomacy," were among his most successful parts. From 1888 Mr. and Mrs. Kendal began a succession of visits to America, interspersed with provincial tours, so that they were seen very little in London from that date. In 1908 they practically retired from the stage.

8. **Viscount Arbuthnott, William**, twelfth Viscount, was the fourth son of the ninth Viscount, and was born in 1849. He succeeded his brother in the title in 1911. His father, who died in 1891, left four sons and two daughters, and of these four sons, three have held the title in succession. All the sons died unmarried,

and the title now devolves on the late peer's cousin, Lieutenant-Colonel Walter Charles Warner Arbuthnott, late R.A., only surviving son of the second son of the eighth Viscount.

18. **Rear-Admiral John Leslie Burr, C.M.G., M.V.O.,** King's Harbour Master at Holyhead, was 70 years of age. As Lieutenant of the *Agus*, he served during the Ashanti War, 1873-74, being twice mentioned in dispatches, and receiving the medal. Admiral Burr was made C M G. in 1899, and M.V.O. in 1904. He retired with the rank of Captain in 1905, and volunteered for further service on the outbreak of the European War.

15. **Dr. Edward Burd, M.D., Cantab.,** was the foremost Consulting Physician in Shropshire. He was educated at Shrewsbury School, at Caius College, where he took his degree more than sixty years ago, and at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. He was Physician to the Salop Infirmary, an Examiner at Cambridge, and President of the Shropshire branch of the British Medical Association.

16 **George Atherton Aitken, C.B., M.V.O.,** was born in 1860, and educated at King's College School and at University College, London. In 1883 he entered the Post Office, rose to be Secretary to Sir A. Blackwood, and nine years later entered the Home Office. From an early date at the Home Office he was associated with the administration of the law relating to children and child welfare. In 1913 the department of the Home Office which deals with all matters connected with the welfare of children was placed under his charge. Besides being a highly efficient Civil servant, he was considered to be one of the first authorities on the Queen Anne period of English Literature. He specialised on Swift and Defoe, and edited Marvell, Burns, and Thomas Parnell, whose life he wrote for the "Dictionary of National Biography." From 1896 to 1901 he produced the narrative romances of Defoe, *The Spectator*, *The Tatler*, and "The Journal to Stella." He also edited plays by Steele and Sheridan.

17 **Sir Charles Holroyd,** late Director of the National Gallery, and a noted authority on Art, was born in 1861. The son of William Holroyd, a merchant of Leeds, he was educated at Leeds Grammar School, and at the Yorkshire College of Science, but at

the age of 18 he came to London to study Art at the Slade School under Legros. There he won a travelling studentship which enabled him to work for two years in Italy, and during that time he worked at painting. On his return to London he became assistant teacher at the Slade School under Legros, and was a frequent exhibitor at the Royal Academy and elsewhere. He also became a member of the Royal Society of Painter-Etchers, which had been newly founded, and produced nearly 300 plates of excellent quality, among which may be mentioned the "Monte Oliveto" set, and several illustrating the English Lake District. In 1897 he was appointed first keeper of Sir Henry Tate's newly founded National Gallery of British Art at Millbank, here he was so successful that in 1906, on the resignation of Sir Edward Poynter, he was appointed to the Directorship of the National Gallery, a post which he held for two terms of five years, when failing health prevented him seeking reappointment. During his term of office at the National Gallery many important acquisitions were made, the chief of which was the Rokey "Venus," by Velasquez, and he also accomplished a very important piece of administrative work by which there was brought out a number of neglected canvases from the vast Turner bequest, and the transfer of a large portion of that bequest to the Tate Gallery. He was knighted in 1903.

17. **François Auguste Rodin** was born in 1840 in Paris. At the age of 14 he went to a drawing school, where he learnt to draw from memory, but showed no especial talent. About this time he had the good fortune to obtain some teaching from Barye, then the best sculptor in France, and while still a boy he became assistant to a sculptor of architectural ornament. At the age of 23 he produced his first great work, "The Man with the Broken Nose." It was rejected by the Salon. In the same year he became assistant to Carrier-Belleuse, a fashionable sculptor, and at this time he acquired great dexterity. In 1870 he went with Carrier-Belleuse to Brussels and soon afterwards entered into partnership with a Belgian sculptor, Van Rasbong, with whom he executed some of the sculpture on the Brussels Bourse. At this time he made a study of Gothic sculpture and architecture, which greatly influenced all his later work. In 1875 he went to Italy to study Michelangelo and Donatello.

In 1877 he produced the famous "Age of Bronze," and returned to Paris. "The Age of Bronze" was exhibited at the Salon, and was cast in bronze and purchased by the State. Rodin still earned his living by working for other sculptors, and his original works were produced in his leisure hours. In 1881 his "St. John" was exhibited in bronze in the Salon—there is a replica of this work at South Kensington. From 1882 to 1885 he produced many fine portrait busts, and he began to become famous. In 1886 he received a commission for the monument to Bastien-Lepage, which was unveiled in 1889. In 1880 Rodin received the commission for the "Gate of Hell" for the Musée des Arts Décoratifs. This great work occupied him for a great part of his life, and suggested motives for other great works—the "Thinker," the "Eternal Spring," and the "Eve." In 1886 Rodin received the commission for the monument to the Burghers of Calais, all the figures of which were exhibited in plaster in 1889. This work shows the influence of his studies in Gothic sculpture. At the Paris Exhibition of 1900, a building was erected in which nearly all Rodin's works were shown, and he was universally recognised as the greatest of modern sculptors. In 1913 he was elected President of the International Society in succession to Whistler. In later years he was chiefly occupied in finishing works begun earlier, among them the monument to Victor Hugo. He gave lavishly to his own country and to England, and early in the European War he gave twenty works to the British nation as a token of admiration for our soldiers; and in 1916, by a deed of gift, presented all the remaining works in his possession to France.

18 Lieutenant-General Sir Stanley Maude, K.C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., died after a brief illness whilst commanding the British Expeditionary Force in Mesopotamia. Born in 1864, he joined the Coldstream Guards in 1884, and became Adjutant of the 1st Coldstream in 1888, and after passing the Staff College, was Brigade-Major of the Brigade of Guards from 1897 to the outbreak of war in South Africa. In South Africa he took part in the advance on Kimberley, and operations in the Free State and Transvaal, receiving the Queen's Medal with six clasps, and the D.S.O. From 1901 to 1904 he served as Military Secretary to the Governor-General of Canada, then returned to London as Private

Secretary to the Secretary of State for War, and was on the Staff at Plymouth from 1906 to 1908. He then became closely connected with the Territorial Force, and from 1909 to 1912 he became Assistant Director of the Territorial Force at the War Office under Sir John Cowans. When the European War broke out Maude was on the General Staff of the 5th Division, and he accompanied the division to France, taking part in all the early operations of the campaign. He was given command of the 14th Infantry Brigade, and was severely wounded. In 1915 he became Major-General and received command of the 13th Infantry Division, which was transferred from France to the Dardanelles, thence to Egypt and subsequently to Mesopotamia. In 1916 General Maude succeeded Sir Percy Lake in command in Mesopotamia, and he at once started to reorganise his army, and to improve his line of communications, and in this hard task the arrangements had so far succeeded that when he went up to the front from Basra, his advance was assured. In the middle of December he marched with all his forces, cleared both banks of the Hai up to Kut, where the Turks stood on both banks of the Tigris, well entrenched. With great vigour Maude fought the Turks out of their trenches and back into Kut. He then launched his main attack across the river at Shumian, which proved an unqualified success, and the Turkish retreat followed. Maude pursued with the least possible delay, and on March 11 he entered Bagdad. Then followed another long period of preparation and reinforcement. On September 28 he attacked the Turkish division at Ramadi, on the Euphrates, and after a severe fight carried the advanced position and encircled the enemy, compelling him to surrender on September 29. Then the Turks on the Tigris moved down against Maude, but he was able to take their strongly entrenched position from them, covering Tekrit on November 5. Maude remained at this place for three days, but then brought back his troops to their original positions. His loss at this time, when his services were so greatly needed, is deplorable. He was always popular, thoroughly acquainted with his profession, and always successful.

18 Captain the Hon. Neil Primrose, M.C., M.P., died of wounds received while serving with a Yeomanry regiment on an Eastern Front. He was the younger son of the Earl of Rosebery, and in his 35th year. Educated

at Eton and New College, Oxford, he entered public life early as an Alderman of the London County Council. At the General Election of January, 1910, he stood as Liberal Candidate for the Wisbech Division of Cambridgeshire, and was elected by a majority of 200. His maiden speech, on the resolutions of Mr. Asquith's Government on the relations between the two Houses of Parliament, was considered to be an exceptionally fine one. In 1914, when the Irish controversy was reaching its height, Mr. Primrose took an independent line, and became head of the "Law and Order" group of Liberals, who strongly criticised the Government for not taking proceedings against those who were actively associated with the landing of arms in Ulster. It was soon afterwards that the European War broke out, and Mr. Primrose at once rejoined the Yeomanry, and was engaged in military service until February, 1915, when he was brought back to the House of Commons to be Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. In little more than three months there was a change of Government and he was succeeded by Lord Robert Cecil. He returned to his military duties, and came back again to the House of Commons in the autumn of 1916, when he was appointed Parliamentary Military Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions. His tenure of this office too was very short, for in December, 1916, when Mr. Lloyd George formed his Government, Mr. Primrose was appointed joint Chief Whip with Lord Edmund Talbot. His duties were not congenial to him, and he resigned his appointment, and for the third and last time went on military service. In 1915 Mr. Primrose married Lady Victoria Stanley, only daughter of Lord and Lady Derby, and leaves a daughter.

18. Colonel Edmund Grey Skinner, C.B., was born in 1850, and educated at Wimbledon and at Sandhurst. He joined the Army Ordnance Department in 1867 and took part in the Perak Expedition of 1875-76. He saw service in the Egyptian Expedition of 1882 and was mentioned in dispatches, and in the Sudan operations he was C.O.O. of the expedition. For his services in Egypt he held the medal and clasp, the bronze star, and the 4th Class Medjidie. He was made C.B. in 1891 and retired from the service in 1901.

20. Lord Forester. Cecil Theodore Weld-Forester, fifth Baron, was in his 76th year. He succeeded his father in

the barony in 1894. From 1874 to 1885 he was member for the Wenlock Division, and was three times Mayor of Much Wenlock. He was Deputy-Lieutenant, Magistrate, and County Councillor for Salop. He married in 1866 Emma Georgina, daughter of Sir W. W. Dixie. He is succeeded in the barony by his eldest son, Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. G. C. B. Weld-Forester.

21. Alderman Sir Henry Edmund Knight, senior member of the Aldermanic body of the City of London, was born in 1838, and educated at the City of London School. He became a member of the Corporation for Cripplegate Ward in 1867, was elected Alderman in September, 1874, and in the following year became Sheriff of London and Middlesex. In 1882-83 he became Lord Mayor, and during his term of office numerous important functions were performed and many relief funds established. On leaving office he received the honour of knighthood.

22. Dr. J. Bass Mullinger, the historian of the University of Cambridge, was educated at University College, London, and St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in double honours, taking both the Classical and Moral Science Triposes. He was author of several books, the most important of which is his monumental "History of the University of Cambridge down to the Decline of the Platonists," the first volume of which appeared in 1873; the third in 1911. He was also a contributor to the "Dictionary of National Biography." In 1912 the University of Cambridge conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature.

— Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. E. Noel was the second son of the second Earl of Gainsborough. He served in the Rifle Brigade in the Ashanti Campaign, 1873-74, where he received the medal and clasp, in the Jowaki Expedition, 1878 (medal and clasp), and in Burma, 1886-87 (medal and clasp). He served for many years in India and in Ceylon, and in the East he acquired an intimate knowledge of Oriental Languages. He travelled a great deal in order to study military history, and was the author of several books. At the outbreak of the European War he offered his services to the Censor Department of the War Office, where his unusual knowledge of foreign

languages enabled him to do most useful work.

22. Colonel Dudley North, C.B., was 77 years of age. He was educated at Harrow, joined the 47th Regiment in 1858, and afterwards commanded the 2nd Battalion. From 1892 till 1897 he was Assistant Adjutant-General in Canada, when he retired from the service.

23. Sir William Goff Davis-Goff, Bart., was born in 1838 and educated at Dublin University. He was High Sheriff at Waterford City in 1869 and 1899, and High Sheriff of the county in 1892, and was created a baronet in 1905 after the visit of King Edward and Queen Alexandra to Waterford, in whose reception Sir William had taken a leading part. Sir William was one of the finest sportsmen of his time, was an accomplished yachtsman, and made his mark as an oarsman at Trinity College. He will be remembered as the pioneer of the motor industry and of motoring in Ireland.

25. Sir Thomas Gordon Walker, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., a former Acting Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, was 69 years of age. He first was posted to the Punjab in 1872 and did good work as Settlement Officer of the Ludhiana district from 1877 to 1883. He served in both judicial and executive appointments, as an Acting Judge of the Chief Court, and then as Commissioner of Delhi. In 1907 he was Financial Commissioner of the Punjab when in the spring of that year the late Sir Denzil Ibbotson broke down in health and came to England, and Sir Thomas filled the acting appointment during a year of special difficulty. Sir Thomas retired in the spring of 1908. He was made an LL.D. of Aberdeen in 1910.

26. Dr. Elsie Inglis, M.B., C.M., the originator of the Scottish Women's Hospitals, was the second daughter of John Forbes David Inglis, Chief Commissioner at Lucknow, and was born in India. She was educated in Edinburgh and Paris. As a medical woman she specialised in surgery, and for many years held the post of Joint Surgeon to the Edinburgh Hospital and Dispensary for Women and Children, and was also Lecturer on Systematic Gynaecology in the Royal Colleges School of Medicine, Edinburgh. She had a large practice in Edinburgh, and was one of the keenest supporters of all forms of women's work, and played an important part in connexion with the medical

education of women in Scotland. On the outbreak of the European War, Dr. Inglis carried out the idea of forming the Scottish Women's Hospitals, staffed entirely by women. The British War Office refused to acknowledge hospitals entirely staffed by women, and Dr. Inglis and her committee offered their services to the Allies and they were at once accepted. In April, 1915, Dr. Inglis left for Serbia to act as Commissioner to the Scottish Women's Hospitals established there. It was at this time that the typhus epidemic was raging, it had already carried off one-third of the Serbian Army Medical Corps, and the situation was desperate. But thanks to her great organising powers and the devotion and sacrifices of a band of British, French and American relief workers, the typhus epidemic was mastered. The condition of things in Serbia was even worse when the united forces of Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, and Bulgarians again assaulted the country. Dr. Inglis remained with the people and performed most heroic work, and declining to leave her Serbian wounded she was captured with her staff at Kruševatz by the enemy. After remaining a short time as prisoners of war she and her staff were released and sent home. She did not remain at home long, but set out for the Dobrudja where she was attached to the Southern Slav Division that fought alongside the Russian troops. She went through the Rumanian retreat with the Southern Slav Division and remained with it until her recent return from Russia. For the heroic services which she rendered to Serbia the Crown Prince conferred on her the Order of the White Eagle. She is the only woman on whom such an honour has been conferred.

26. Sir Leander Starr Jameson was born in 1853, the tenth son of a well-known Writer to the Signet and journalist. He began life as a medical student at University College Hospital, and was beginning to do good work as a young surgeon when he had an offer of a partnership in Kimberley. He went out to South Africa in 1878, and it was not long before he came into association with Cecil Rhodes. In 1889 Rhodes asked Jameson to assist him, the negotiations with the Matabele Chief, which preceded the formation of the Chartered Company, were on the point of breaking down. Jameson set out to Matabeleland as Rhodes's ambassador, his influence with Lobengula was such that he succeeded in

his mission without any delay, and Lobengula assented to the famous expedition of the pioneers, Jameson accompanying them, in 1890. In the following year he returned to Salisbury as Administrator. Jameson's Administratorsip of Rhodesia lasted from 1891 to 1894, and when in 1893 the Matabele suddenly rose, his influence was so strong that the settlement held together. Jameson marched with his column from Salisbury to Bulawayo and there, after the flight of Lobengula, he remained to establish a second British Administration on the model of the first. In 1894 he came with Rhodes on a visit to England. The creation of Rhodesia caused great resentment in the Transvaal Republic, and the enormous influx of the Uitlanders to the Rand presented President Kruger with great difficulties. The people of Johannesburg were clamouring for reforms and there was great discontent and unrest. In December, 1895, Jameson appeared on the Bechuanaland border at the head of a small force of Chartered Company's police and volunteers, waiting for the expected rising in Johannesburg. On the 28th he rode into the Transvaal and was surrounded four days later at Doornkop, and was forced to surrender on the following morning. This action of Jameson's was repudiated by the authorities at home as soon as it was known, and he was brought back to England for trial and to prison. He remained in Holloway Prison just over four months, and was released owing to the bad state of his health. He

returned to South Africa and helped Rhodes in meeting the numerous troubles that occurred in Rhodesia. In 1902 Rhodes died, and Jameson was elected to his seat in the Cape House of Assembly, and in 1904 Jameson became the recognised leader of the Progressive Party. The election of 1904 resulted in a majority for the Progressives and Jameson took office as Prime Minister. The Ministry fell in 1908. The rest of Jameson's career in South Africa was spent in furthering the political union between the four Colonies, and the Bloemfontein Conference of 1910 was perhaps his greatest achievement, and the policy which he then urged upon the Unionist Party of South Africa has since been maintained. In March, 1912, Jameson was compelled by illness to resign his leadership of the Unionist Party and he came to England. In June, 1913, he was elected Chairman of the Chartered Company. At the outbreak of the European War the Government offered him the Chairmanship of the Central Prisoners of War Committee and he accepted the task at once, besides organising more than one private hospital abroad.

30. Sir William Lewis Salusbury-Trelawny was the tenth baronet and succeeded his father in 1885. He was formerly a Captain in the Royal Cornwall Rangers (Militia), and was a Magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for Cornwall, and High Sheriff for that county in 1891 and 1895. He was twice married and leaves three sons and three daughters.

DECEMBER.

3. The Rev. Sir Emilius Laurie, Bart., was born in 1823, the son of Sir John Bayley, whom he succeeded in 1871. He assumed the name of Laurie in 1886 on succeeding to Maxwellton, Thornhill, Dumfriesshire, under the will of his great-uncle, Sir Robert Laurie. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1846 was ordained by the Bishop of Oxford. In 1867 he became vicar of St. John, Paddington, and remained there until he retired from active parochial work in 1889. He was the author of many devotional works.

4 Earl of Portsmouth was in his 62nd year, and succeeded to the title as the sixth earl in 1891. He was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford. As Lord Lymington he was elected Liberal member for Barnstaple

in 1880 and for North Devon in 1885. In 1886 he was returned for North Devon as a Liberal-Unionist and sat for that division until 1891. In 1905, having rejoined the Liberal Party, he was appointed to be Parliamentary Under-Secretary for War and held the post until 1908. He married, in 1845, Beatrice May, daughter of Edward Pease. There is no issue, and the heir to the earldom is the Hon. John Fellowes Wallop, brother of the late earl.

4. Colonel Sir Samuel Swinton Jacob, K.C.I.E., C.V.O., was in his 77th year. The son of Colonel W. Jacob of the Bombay Artillery he went to the East India Company's Military College at Addiscombe, obtained a direct commission to the artillery and went out to India. In 1863 he qualified

as surveyor and civil engineer, and after a short time in the Bombay Public Works Department, in 1866 he accepted the position of engineer to the Jaipuri State, and he remained there until 1911. He will be remembered for his enthusiasm regarding Indo-Saracenic Architecture, and evidences of his skill are to be found in every part of Northern India.

5 **Brigadier-General Roland Boys Bradford, V.C., M.C.**, was born in 1892, entered the Regular Army from the Territorial Force in May, 1912, obtaining his commission in the Durham L.I., and was promoted to the rank of brigadier-general a short while before his death. In November, 1916, he was awarded the V.C., "for most conspicuous bravery and good leadership in attack."

— **Rev. William Macdonald Sinclair, D.D.**, who was Archdeacon of London from 1889 to 1911, was born in 1850. Educated at Repton School in 1869 he won a scholarship at Balliol. In 1874 he was ordained deacon and priest, and in 1877 he came to London and was appointed resident Chaplain to Bishop Jackson. In 1889 the Archdeaconry of London fell vacant, and Dr Temple appointed Sinclair to the post. He was elected to the London School Board in 1885, and he entered into the controversies on religious education. In 1911 he retired from London and the Archdeaconry, and accepted the rectory of Shermanbury, Sussex, a living which he held until 1916.

— **Pasquale Villari**, the eminent Italian historian, was born at Naples in 1827. In 1848 he took part in the unsuccessful movement for independence, and on its failure he left Naples for Florence, and here he began to collect new materials for his projected work on Savonarola. He was appointed Professor of the Philosophy of History at the University of Pisa in 1859, and in the same year he published the "Life of Savonarola," a work which at once made him famous. In 1862 Villari was recalled to Florence to occupy the Chair of History at the new "Istituto," and in 1863 he came to London to represent the Italian Government in the Educational Section of the International Exhibition. His social political writings had great influence amongst his countrymen, and the "Lettere Meridionali," in which he showed up the dangerous condition of the Neapolitan provinces, aroused great consternation; but his views led

to many reforms. Soon afterwards Villari produced his second most important work, the "Life of Machiavelli." Most of the later years of Villari's life were devoted to research into the origins of Italian, and more especially Florentine, history. In 1867 he was first elected to the Chamber of Deputies but did not take his seat until 1873, and then he took it as Deputy for Guastalla. In 1884 he was appointed to the Senate, of which in 1897 he was elected Vice-President. He was Minister of Education in the De Rudini Cabinet in 1891, and he made his influence felt to the great advantage of the Department. He was an honorary D.O.L. of Oxford and had many other academic distinctions. In January, 1910, he was invested with the Collare of the Annunziata, a decoration given very rarely to those not of Royal blood. His activity was enormous, a bibliography published in 1907 mentions more than 400 of his publications, mainly on history, education, and art.

5 **Dr. Arthur Weld Downing, F.R.S.**, for many years Superintendent of the *Nautical Almanac*, was born in Ireland in 1850. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he won the gold medal for mathematics of his year. After leaving the University he entered the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, as an assistant and remained in this post for twenty years. In 1875 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society and wrote many papers on subjects connected with the exact determination of the places of the stars and of the movements of the planets. In 1892 he became Superintendent of the *Nautical Almanac*, and for eighteen years the preparation of the "Seaman's Bible" was in his hands. He resigned his post in 1910. He was an honorary D.Sc. of Trinity College, Dublin, and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1896.

10 **Colonel Sir Lorenzo George Dundas, K.C.B.**, was 80 years of age, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1855 he joined the 62nd Regiment; and in 1873 he retired from the Army after having commanded the 6th Battalion the Royal Fusiliers. Sir Lorenzo Dundas received the Crimean medal and clasps and the Turkish medal.

— **Sir Walter Richard Plummer**, who was a member of an old Tyneside family, was in his 60th year. He carried on business as a merchant on the Quayside. In 1900 he was

returned at the head of the poll as Conservative member for Newcastle. In the General Election of 1906 he was defeated and did not re-enter Parliament. He was knighted in 1904. Sir Walter was a D.C.L. of Durham University, a member of the Tyne Commission, a Justice of the Peace for twenty-one years, and a director of the North-Eastern Railway Company.

11. **Sir Mackenzie Bowell**, formerly Prime Minister of Canada, was born in 1823. At the age of 10 his parents moved to Canada, and when he was 14 he was beginning to earn his own living in the office of a Conservative newspaper in Belleville, Ontario. In 1867 he took his seat in the first Parliament of the Confederated Dominion, and from that date he never failed to be re-elected. In 1878 he became Minister of Customs, and in 1892 was made Minister of Trade and Commerce. As senior member of the Cabinet, he acted for the Premier during his absence from Canada, and upon the sudden death of Sir John Thompson, he was asked by the Governor-General to re-form the Ministry which he did on December 19, 1894. His tenure of office of Prime Minister was short and full of strife. Bowell was Leader of the Senate from 1893 to 1906. On retiring from office with the defeat of his party in 1896, he resumed the editorship of the *Belleville Intelligencer*, which he continued until his death.

15. **Don Gumersindo de Azcárate**, the Spanish Republican Leader, was born at Leon in 1840. He took his degree at the University of Oviedo, and was appointed an Assistant Professor of "Comparative Legislation" in the Central University at Madrid in 1868. From that date Señor Azcárate represented in the Cortes his native city, Leon, as a Republican of the moderate type.

17. **Mrs. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, M.D.**, was the daughter of Mr. Newson Garrett, and was born in London in 1836. She was one of the pioneers of the movement for the "emancipation" of women whose aim was to throw open to them the profession of medicine. She was herself the first woman to secure a medical diploma in this country. In 1860 she began her medical studies, but the obstacles in the way of any serious study were great. In the first place there was no school where she could be received, and there was no examining body will-

ing to admit her to its examinations. After a time the Society of Apothecaries was advised that they had no legal ground for refusing to admit a woman to its examination, and they therefore authorised Miss Garrett to get her education privately from teachers of recognised schools, and in 1865 she obtained the desired qualification of L.S.A. In 1866 she opened a dispensary near Lisson Grove for the benefit of poor women and children, and for some years she was the only Medical Officer there. In 1870 Miss Garrett took the M.D. of Paris, and other women doing the same she was able to get assistance at her dispensary, which was afterwards converted into a small hospital, and later developed into the "New Hospital for Women" in the Euston Road. In the same year she became a member of the London School Board. In 1871 she married Mr. J. G. S. Anderson, but she continued in her profession as actively as before, devoting herself chiefly to the diseases of women and children. Miss Jex-Blake and Mrs. Garrett Anderson joined with other ladies and established the London School of Medicine for Women in 1874. Miss Jex-Blake had tried in vain to secure admission to the medical schools in Edinburgh, but it was not until 1877, when the Women's School joined with the Royal Free Hospital, Gray's Inn Road, that all the requirements of the General Medical Council of England were met. The feeling in the medical profession against women was still strong, and until 1892 Miss Garrett Anderson remained the only female member of the British Medical Association. For twenty-three years she was Lecturer on Medicine at the London School of Medicine for Women, and for ten years its Dean, and for twenty-four years she was Senior Physician of the New Hospital for Women. In 1896-97 she was President of the East Anglian branch of the British Medical Association, and in 1903 she was elected Mayor of Aldeburgh, being the first woman made a Mayor in England. Mrs. Garrett Anderson's sister is Miss Millicent Garrett Fawcett, to whose husband, the blind Postmaster-General, she acted as medical adviser. Herson, Sir Alan Garrett Anderson, succeeded Sir Eric Geddes as Controller of the Navy in August, 1917.

19. **Colonel Sir Howland Roberts, V.D., D.L., J.P.**, twelfth and fifth baronet of Glassenburg, was born in 1845, the second son of the tenth and third baronet, was educated at King's College, London, and became an ensign

in the London Irish Regiment which he commanded from 1896 to 1906

20. Lord Kinnear. Alexander Smith Kinnear, was born in 1838, and educated at Glasgow and Edinburgh Universities. He was called to the Scottish Bar in 1856. For a few years he was on the staff of the Court of Session reports, but he gave up this work when he became leading Counsel in the Court of Session for the liquidators in the noted case of the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank. In 1881 he succeeded Patrick Fraser as Dean of Faculty, and in the following year, on the death of Lord Curriehill, he was appointed a Judge with the courtesy title of Lord Kinnear. In 1890, on the resignation of Lord Shand, he took his seat in the First Division of the Inner House as an Appellate Judge. He retired from the Court of Session in 1913, but after that date he frequently took part in the hearing of appeals in the House of Lords. In 1889 Kinnear was appointed Chairman of the Commission set up under the Universities (Scotland) Act of that year, and in recognition of his services he was made a peer in 1897. As a young man he contributed several scholarly articles to the reviews. Lord Kinnear was an LL.D. of both Glasgow and Edinburgh Universities

— **Felix Moscheles**, the portrait painter, was born in London in 1833, the son of the distinguished pianist and composer, Ignaz Moscheles. He was named after Felix Mendelssohn, who was a lifelong friend of his father. Educated at first at King's College he was afterwards sent to Hamburg and Karlsruhe. He received his early lessons in drawing from a Herr Brauer, whose successful methods determined Moscheles to adopt art as his profession, and in 1850 he went to Paris to continue his studies. He also studied under Van Lerino in Antwerp, and afterwards settled in London, having a studio in the old Cadogan Gardens. His artist friends were numerous, and Du Maurier, Whistler, Charles Keene, Poynter, used to meet other famous people at the house of Arthur Lewis. In 1862 Moscheles painted a very fine portrait of Mazzini, and in the eighties, during a visit to America, he painted President Cleveland's portrait, and a year or two later he produced a very fine portrait of Browning. Among other notable works in portraiture were his studies of his mother, Gounod, Rubinstein, Sir James Ingham, and Stanley, the ex-

plorer. His earlier pictures were exhibited at Antwerp and Paris, and he showed regularly in his later years at the Academy, Grosvenor, and New Galleries. Moscheles was President of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, and in politics was a Liberal. He wrote two autobiographical works, "In Bohemia with Du Maurier" and "Fragments of an Autobiography," besides editing Mendelssohn's letters to his parents

20 Major-General Hugh O'Donnell, C.B., D.S.O., was born in 1858, and educated privately in England and Germany. In 1878 he received his first commission in the 8th, the King's Regiment, from Sandhurst. In 1880, on entering the Indian Staff Corps, he joined the 44th Gurkha Rifles, and remained with that regiment until he was appointed to raise a Military Police Battalion in 1886. During his five years in Burma he saw much fighting, he was wounded, mentioned in dispatches, received the D.S.O., and the Burma medal with three clasps. In 1911 he was appointed to the command of the Bannu Brigade, North-West Frontier. He was given the C.B. and later made Colonel of the 6th Gurkha Rifles

25 Sir Edgar Reginald Saunders Sebright, eleventh baronet, was born in 1854, and educated at Eton and Magdalen College, Oxford. He succeeded his nephew as eleventh baronet in 1897. In 1892-94 he served on the staff of the Governor of South Australia, and of Lord Kintore, Governor of South Australia, in 1894-95. Sir Edgar was unmarried, and is succeeded by his brother.

— **The Baroness Wentworth** was the daughter of the first Earl of Lovelace and grandchild of the poet Byron. She had a great gift for drawing and had lessons from Ruskin; an architectural drawing which she did at the age of 12 was hung in the Royal Academy. She was a good linguist, being a most distinguished Arabic Scholar. In 1869 she married Mr. Wilfred Blunt and moved in the best literary society of her day. She was a fearless and wonderful rider, and with her husband in the seventies and eighties of the last century she undertook many adventurous journeys in the wildest parts of the Mesopotamian and Arabian deserts. Her last years were spent chiefly in Egypt. Within a few weeks of her 80th birthday she simultaneously finished a book, the

"History of the Arabian Horse," and inherited the ancient barony that had descended to her from her grandmother, Lady Byron.

25. The Dowager Lady Lawrence, C.I., was the widow of the first Lord Lawrence, Viceroy of India from 1864 to 1869, and was in her 93rd year. She married her husband in 1841 and in 1842 they went out to India. They were in India during the Mutiny, and Lady Lawrence's house became the refuge for families whose position was considered to be in danger. Lord Lawrence died in 1879 and Lady Lawrence's active life came to an end at that time.

30. Sir William Heerlein Lindley, the international engineer, was born in 1853 and educated at schools in Blackheath. His father, Walter Lindley, was a well-known engineer,

and his son followed in his footsteps. In 1870 he began his professional career by acting as resident engineer for his father on the waterworks at Budapest, and in 1873 he became engineer to the city of Frankfort-on-Main, where for more than twenty years he was in charge of all branches of municipal engineering. In 1912 he was appointed engineer-in-chief for the design and execution of new water supply and drainage works at Petrograd, but there were difficulties in the way of carrying out the scheme. He designed and constructed a water supply works by which water is brought from a point in the Caucasus to the city of Baku about 112 miles away. In 1878 he became a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers and received a knighthood in 1911 in recognition of the services he had rendered to the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways.

INDEX.

The figures between [] refer to PART I

[*Speeches in Parliament are entered under their subjects under the heading "Parliamentary Speeches," and those outside Parliament under the speaker's name.*]

ABERCROMBY, Lord, Obit., 198
 ABINGER, Lord, Obit., 173
 ACCIDENTS.— MUNITION Factories, Ajax Chemical Works, Barking, 15 ; Ashton - under - Lyne, 11, England, North of, 23, Halifax, [189], [327], 22, Kent, 23, London, [55], 2, South Wales, 14. RAILWAY, Ratho Station, 1
 ADAMSON, W., Chairman of the Labour Party, [180], [190]
 ADAMSON, Sir W., Obit., 164
 ADDISON, Dr., on the causes of industrial unrest, [181] ; appointed Minister in Charge of Reconstruction, [155]
 ADMIRALTY, reorganisation, [112], changes in the methods, 32-34 ; War Staff Group formed, 33
 AERIAL Transport, Civil, Committee appointed, 9
 AFGHANISTAN, [284]
 AFRICA, EAST — ABYSSINIA, [306]. BRITISH EAST AFRICA, [305] GERMAN EAST AFRICA, [304] ; military operations, [305] NYASALAND, [304] PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA, [304]. UGANDA, Coryndon, R. T., appointed Governor, 20
 — NORTH — MOROCCO, [306] TRIPOLI, [306]
 — SOUTH — BEWAARPLAATSEN Moneys Bill, [302] Budget, [301]. Buxton, Lord, at the opening of the Legislature, [301] COUNCILS, provincial, elections, [300]. FINANCE, [301] HERTZOG, Gen., on the rights of South Africa, [302] LOAN, issue of, [302]. NATIONALIST Party, policy, [300]. OVERSEA Contingent, rate of pay, [301] REBELLION of 1914, report of the Commission, [301]. Rhodesia, [303]
 — WEST — LIBERIA, [305] PORTUGUESE WEST AFRICA, [304]
 AIKMAN, Sir R., Obit., 167
 AIR Board, Chairman appointed, 1, takes over the Hotel Cecil, 2
 — Inventions Committee, 22
 — Ministry, constituted, [181]
 — raids, BRITISH, Freiburg, 7 ; Mannheim-on-the-Rhine, 23, Saarbrucken, [40]. FRENCH, Freiburg, 7 GERMAN, Broadstairs, 5 ; Dover, [31], 16, 17 ; Eastern Counties, 5, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22 ;
 Essex, 10, 18, 22, Folkestone, [30], 9 ; Harwich, 13, Kent, [30], [31], 7, 10, 18, 22, Lincolnshire, 18 ; London, [31], [39], [188], [189], [171], [175], 8, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, Margate, [31], 13, 16 ; Ramsgate, [31], 16, Sheerness, [39], 17 ; Southend, 15, Suffolk, 18 ; Thanet, [31], 17 ; Westgate-on-Sea, 5 ; Yorkshire, 16, 18
 AIR raids, method of warning, [175]
 AIRSHIP, British, destruction, 22 ; forced to descend in Holland, 22
 AITKEN, G. A., Obit., 200
 AITKEN, Col. W., Obit., 153
 AITKEN, Dr. J., awarded the Royal Society Medal, 119
 ALBANIA, [267]
 ALBEMARLE, Dow. Countess of, Obit., 167
 ALCOCK, Dr. W. G., appointed organist of Salisbury Cathedral, 2
 ALEXANDRA, Queen, at St. Paul's Cathedral, 7
 ALLENBY, Gen. Sir E. H. H., in command of the Forces in Egypt, 12, conquers Jerusalem, [308], 22, awarded the G.C.M.G., 22
 ALLETON, Lord, Obit., 166
 ALLIED War Council, [33], [184]
 ALLIES, Conference in London, 15 ; Petrograd, [236], 5 ; St Jean de Maurienne, 7, meeting at French Embassy, 10 ; reply to Pres. Wilson's peace negotiations, [51]
 AMERICA — *Vide* Canada, Mexico, Newfoundland, United States
 — SOUTH — ARGENTINA, Germany, apology from, [333] Immigration statistics, [333] Luxburg, Count, messages to Berlin, [332], dismissed, [333]. Submarine campaign, note on, [332]. BRAZIL, Germany, diplomatic relations broken, [331] ; war declared, [332]. Muller, Dr. L., resignation, [331] Neutrality decree, revocation, [332]. Pecanha, N., Foreign Minister, [331]. Submarine campaign, protest against, [331]. CHILI, Sanfuentes, Pres., Prime Minister, [333]. Submarine campaign, protest against, [333] URUGUAY, [334]
 ANDERSON, A. G., appointed Controller of the Wheat Commission, 15

ANDERSON, E. G., Obit., 206
 ANDERSON, Col. R. M. M., K.C.M.G. conferred, 8
 ANSON, Hon. F. W., Obit., 166
 ANTI-SUBMARINE Department, [73]
 ARBUTHENOT, Viscount, Obit., 199
 ARCHER, W. E., Obit., 191
 ARKWRIGHT, B., Obit., 193
 ARMY, British, military operations on the Western Front, [1], [11]-[14], [21]-[24], [31]-[34]; in Salonika, [265], Turkey, [261], prisoners, [12], [13], [14], [28], [24], [32], [33]; volunteers, age of, 9; Tank Corps formed, 14
 — Courts of Enquiry Act, first case, [49], huts erection, Commission, [108], medical examinations, Committee on, [164], Tank, amount collected by, 22
 ART—Retrospect of ALPINE Club, 135.
 BRITISH Museum, 134. GRAFTON Galleries, 135. GROSSEYOR exhibition, 135. LEICESTER Galleries, 135. NATIONAL Gallery, 133. New English Art Club, 135. ROYAL Academy, 134.
 SALES, 136. TATE Gallery, 133
 WALLIS & Sons Gallery, 135
 ASHBURNHAM, Major-Gen. Sir C., Obit., 162
 ASHCOMBE, Lord, Obit., 162
 ASKEW, Major G. A. C., Obit., 193
 ASKEW, Mrs., Obit., 193
 ASQUITH, Rt. Hon. H. H., at Ladybank, [58], Leeds, [172], Liverpool, [176], Birmingham, [186], evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 41, 43, 54
 ATHOLL, Duke of, Obit., 156
 AUCKLAND, Lord, Obit., 184
 AUSTEN, J., centenary celebrated, 14
 AUSTRALIA.—“COMMONWEALTH War Government,” [386]. Conscription, referendums on, [387], [388] FEDERAL Elections, result, [387] HUGHES, W. M., Prime Minister, [385], policy, [386]. LABOUR Party, manifesto on war-aims, [388] Loans, issue of, [388] NEW SOUTH WALES, Davidson, Sir W. E., appointed Governor, [328], 17, Election, general, [386], [389]; Railway, strike, [387]. PARLIAMENT, [386]. QUEENSLAND, proposal to abolish the Legislative Council, [388] RAILWAY, trans-Australian, completion, [388] STRIKES, [387]. TASMANIA, Newdegate, F. A. N., appointed Governor, 3. VICTORIA, Bowser, J., Prime Minister, [389]; election, general, [389]
 — SOUTHERN PEAKE, Mr., Prime Minister, [389]
 — WESTERN—LEFROY, Mr., Prime Minister, [389] MACARTNEY, Sir W. G. E., appointed Governor, 3
 AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.—CLAM-MARTINETZ, Count, Prime Minister, [223]; resignation, [229]; appointed Governor-General of Montenegro, [229]. Constitutional Reform Scheme, [281]. Czecho-Slavs, [229]. Czernin, Count O., Foreign Minister, [223]; policy, [232]; at Brest-Litovsk, [47]; reply to peace proposals, [48]. ESTERHAZY, Count M., Prime Minister, [230]. GERMANY, relations with, [218] Gross, Dr. G., President of the House of Representatives, [229]. ITALY, military operations against, [2], [16]-[18], [33]-[37]. JUGO-SLAVS, [129]. KROBATIN, Gen. Baron von, War Minister, resignation, [227]. LOANS, issue of, [227], [232]. MINISTRY, the new, [229]. NATIONALITIES, principle of, [224]. POLAND, [228]. Political prisoners, amnesty, [230]. Pope's Peace Note reply to, [231]. REICHSRAT, assembled, [228]. RUSSIA, military operations against, [2], [18], peace negotiations, [44]-[46], [232]. SEDLER, Dr. von, Prime Minister, [229]. Stanek, Herr, on the failure of the dual system, [229]. Steinattken, Gen. S. von, War Minister, [227]. Submarine campaign, [225]. Suffrage Reform Bill, [231]. TISZA, Count, on terms of peace, [224], the “principle of nationalities,” [224], resignation, [230]. UNITED STATES, diplomatic relations severed, [226], [319]. WAR, expenditure, [227]. Wekerle, Dr. A., Prime Minister, [230].
 AUSTRIA-HUNGARY—Charles, Emperor, of character of his policy, [224], at the opening of the Reichsrat, [228]. AVAKUMOVITCH, M. Y., Obit., 163
 AZCARATE, Don G. de, Obit., 206
 BABTIE, Sir W., Director of Medical Services in India, 70, 74; censure on, 71
 BABY Week, National, inaugurated, 13
 BAEYER, Prof. A. von, Obit., 188
 BAIRSTOWE, A. W., appointed Recorder of Scarborough, 15
 BAKER, S. M., Obit., 174
 BALDWIN, S., appointed Junior Lord of the Treasury, 3
 BALFOUR, Rt. Hon. A. J., at Sheffield, [59]; mission to Canada and the United States, [316], [322], 11; minute from the Junior Sea Lords, 33
 BALFOUR-BROWNE, J. H., “Recollections, Literary and Political,” 94
 BANK of England, Governor and Deputy Governor, appointment of, 20
 — rate, reduction, 7, 144
 BAR, meeting of the, proposal to admit women, negatived, 2
 BARBER, J. E., “The Great Problems of British Statesmanship,” 103
 BARBER, Very Rev. W., Dean of Carlisle, Obit., 157
 BARKLA, Prof. C. G., awarded the Hughes Medal, 119
 BARNES, Rt. Hon. G. N., member of the War Cabinet, [155], [163], 10, 15; Chairman of the Committee on labour questions, 21
 BARONETCHES conferred, 4, 10; Holland, Sir R. S., 4, Matthews, Sir C., 4; Wakefield, Sir C., 4
 BARROW, Gen. Sir E. G., appointed member of the Council of India, 1; on the expedition to Mesopotamia, 57
 BASU, B. N., appointed member of the Council of India, [289], 12
 BATEMAN, K., Obit., 167
 BATES, G. T., value of his estate, 16
 BATH, Marquis of, Knight of the Garter, 5

BATHURST, Capt. C., appointed Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Sugar Supply, 16

BATTENBERG, Prince A. of, Marquis of Carisbrooke, 11

BATTENBERG, Prince L. of, Marquis of Milford Haven, 11

BAUDOUIN, M. A., Obit., 156

BEAN, C. E. W., "Letters from France," 98

BECK, C., Parliamentary Secretary to National Service, 12

BEECHAM, Sir J., value of his estate, 2

BELGIUM—CIVILIANS, deportation, [268] FLEMISH province, [268]. MONGHEUR, Baron, appointed Minister in London, 19 UNITED STATES reply to the peace note, [268] WALLOON province, [268] Whitaker, J. P., on the conditions of life, [268]

BENCKENDORFF, Count A., Obit., 153

BENNETT, W. H., appointed Governor of British Honduras, 22

BESANT, Dr W. H., Obit., 174

BETHAM-EDWARDS, M., "Twentieth Century France," 100

BILLINGTON, Mrs J., Obit., 155

BILLS.—AIR Force, [181] Appropriation, [193]. CONSOLIDATED Fund, [66], [87], [129], [168] Coin Production, [107], [142], [154] [159] Criminal Law Amendment, [67]. EDUCATION, [160]. Enemy titles, [91]. FINANCE, [152] Franchise Reform, [122], [177], [181], [187], [188] METALS, Non-ferrous, [188]. Military Service, [93], [97], [141] Ministry of Reconstruction, [156] Munitions of War, [111] NATIONAL Service, [74] PARLIAMENT, extension, [102], [182] REPRESENTATION of the People, [122]. SOLICITORS (Qualification of Women), [76] VENEREAL Disease, [103]

BINNIE, Sir A. R., Obit., 172

BINNING, Brig.-Gen. Lord, Obit., 154

BIRDWOOD, Sir G., Obit., 179

BIRMINGHAM Food Control Scheme, [191]

BISHOP, Capt. W. A., awarded the V.C., 15

BISSING, Baron von, Obit., 168

BLACKE, P. V. de la, "La France de l'Est," 102

BLACKWELL, publication of, "The Compleat Schoolmarm," 106

BLACKWOOD, Second Lieut. Lord B., Obit., 189

BLAKISTON, J. R., Obit., 190

BLEICHRÖDER, H. von, Obit., 154

BOKHARA and Khiva, [283]

BOLS, Major-Gen. L. J., appointed Chief of the General Staff, 20

BORDEN, Sir F. W., Obit., 152

BORDEN, Sir R., at the Imperial War Conference, [98]

BORTHWICK, Lady, Obit., 161

BOULTER, S. C., Obit., 152

BOUNDARY Commissioners, scheme of re-distribution, [125], [177]

BOWELL, Sir M., Obit., 206

BOWMAN, Sir W. P., Obit., 152

BOYD-CARPENTER, Rev. A. B., Obit., 166

BRADFORD, Brig.-Gen. R. B., Obit., 205

BRAITHWAITE, Dr. R., Obit., 195

BRAND, Hon. A. G., Obit., 153

BREAD, standard, compulsory baking, 1, price of, [151], [168], 4, 6, report on, [186], [150]; weight [77]

BRIDGE, Adm. Sir C., member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56

BRITISH Army. *See Army*

— Association, meeting abandoned, 119

— Empire, Order of the, 12, 16, Dames and Knights (Grand Cross, Connaught, H. R. H. Duke of, 16, Emmott, Lord, 16, Furse, Mrs. K., 16, Geddes, Sir E., 16, Lawley, Hon. Lady, 16, Mary, Queen, 16, Moulton, Lord, 16, Paget, Lady, 16, Pearson, Sir A., 16, Reid, Lady, 16; Sydenham, Lord, 16

— Expeditionary Force, decoration to be conferred, 17

— Red Cross Society, amount of *The Times* fund, 2, 12, 21

— Science Guild, 120

— Trade Corporation, [92] *See Trade*

BROADSTAIRS, raids on, 4, 5

BROMLEY, Capt. C., awarded the V.C., 5

BROOKE, Sir C. J., Obit., 172

BROOKING, Major-Gen. Sir H. T., K. C. M. G. conferred, 19

BROWNE, Sir B. C., Obit., 163

BROWNE, E. A., Obit., 179

BROWNLOW, Countess, Obit., 165

BRUCE, Hon. A., Obit., 193

BRUN, Dr M. J. d'A., Obit., 163

BRUNYATE, J. B., appointed member of the Council of India, 6

BRYCE, Lord, at the Pilgrims' Club, [102], Committee on the reconstruction of the House of Lords, [179]

BRYMER, Ven. F. A., Obit., 170

BUCCLEUCH, Duke of, Knight of the Thistle, 6

BUCHAN, J., appointed Director of Information under the Prime Minister, 4

BULGARIA, [267]

BULGARIA, Queen E. of, Obit., 189

BURBIDGE, Sir R., Obit., 174

BURD, Dr E., Obit., 200

BURNAND, Sir F. C., Obit., 169

BURNETT, Lady, Obit., 172

BURR, Rear-Adm. J. L., Obit., 200

BURROWS, Sir E. P., Obit., 185

BUSHELL, Rev. W. D., Obit., 186

BUTLER, Sir S. H., appointed Lieut.-Governor of Agra and Oudh, [288], 5

BYLES, Rear-Adm. M., Obit., 190

BYLES, Sir W. F., Obit., 195

BYNG, Lieut.-Gen. the Hon. Sir J., promoted General, 21

CABS, whistling for, in London, prohibited, 16

CALLAGHAN, Adm. Sir G., appointed Admiral of the Fleet, 6

CALTHORP, G., in control of the coal-mines, 4

CALVERT, A. F., "The Grand Lodge of England," 105

CAMBRIDGE University Press, publication of, "Germany, 1815-1890," 98

CAMPBELL, Com. G., awarded the V.C., 7

CANADA.—BAFOUR, A. J., mission to, [322], 11. COALITION Ministry, [326]. Compulsory military service, [319]. [321]; Bill, [322].[324]. Conscription

Bill, [323]. DEVONSHIRE, Duke of, at the opening of Parliament, [321] ELECTION campaign, [326], result, [327], provincial, [327] FINANCE, [322]. Franchise Bill, [325] HALIFAX, explosion at, [189], [327], 22. LOANS, issue of, [322], [326] PARLIAMENT, opened, [321], dissolved, [325] WAR Conference, in London, [322] Winnipeg, Convention at, [324] CAPPER, Major-General Sir J. E., appointed Director-General of the Tank Corps, 16 CARDEN, Vice-Adm., evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 37 CARRERO, T., Obit., 177 CARSON, Sir E., First Lord of the Admiralty, retires, [155], member of the War Cabinet, [155] CARSON, T. H., Obit., 180 CARTER, Prof. J. B., Obit., 184. CARTER, Maj., on the condition of the wounded in Mesopotamia, 72, 77 CASSELL & Co., publication of "Belgium Under the German Heel," 97, "Letter, from Fiance," 98 CASTENSKIOLD, Mme de G. R., Obit., 154 CATES, Second Lieut. G. E., awarded the V.C., 9 CAWLEY, Sir F., member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24 CLOWSTON, J. W., appointed Deputy-Master of the Mint, 10 CAYZER, Sir C., value of his estate, 2, Obit., 182 CAZIN, M., Obit., 158 CECIL, Lord H., member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56 CHAMBERLAIN, Rt Hon. A., Secretary of State for India, resignation, [145], 13, in Paris, 23 CHAMBERLAIN, N., National Service Scheme, [61], [74], resignation, 5 CHAMBERS, J., appointed Solicitor-General for Ireland, 6, Obit., 176 CHAPMAN & Hall, publication of "Madame Adam, La Grande Francaise," 93, "Twentieth Century France," 110 CHATTERJI, Sir P. C., Obit., 186 CHAVASSE, Capt. N. G., awarded a bar to his V.C., 17 CHEQUERS, estate of, gift, 18 CHERRY, Capt. P. H., awarded the V.C., 9 CHETWYND, Sir G., Obit., 164 CHINA—AUSTRIA-Hungary, war declared against, [297] CHANG Hsun, Gen., concentrates troops in Peking, [295], defeated, [296], exiled, [297] FEN Kuo-Chang, President, [296] GERMANY, war declared against, [292], [297], members of the Legation dismissed, [293]. LI CHUNG-HSI, elected Prime Minister, [294], refuses to serve, [295] LI Yuan-Hung, Gen., President, [292] MILITARISTS, Provisional Government at Tientsin, [294]. Monarchy, restoration, [295] NORTHERN and Southern Parties, conflict between, [294]. PARLIAMENT dissolved, [294]. Peking, fighting at, [296]. SUBMARINE campaign, protest against, [298]. TUAN-Chi-Jui, Prime Minister, [292], [296]; policy, [293], dismissed, [293], marches on Peking, [295]; manifesto, [296]; resignation, [297]. UNITED STATES, relations with, [292] WANG Shih-cheng, Prime Minister, [294], [297] Wu Ting-fang, appointed Acting Prime Minister, [294], resignation, [295] CHOATE, J. H., Obit., 171 CHURCHILL, Rt Hon. W., appointed Minister of Munitions, [155], evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 28, 30; minute from the Junior Sea Lords, 33, at the meeting of the War Council, 40, 46 CLARKE, Dr E. C., Obit., 182 CLARKE, Lieut.-Col. A. F. S., Obit., 185 CLAYTON, Maj. Sir E. G., Obit., 183 CLAYTON, Rt Rev. L., Obit., 179 CLONBROCK, Lord, Obit., 171 CLYDE, deported men, [56], allowed to return, 10 CLYDE, J. A., member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24 CLYNES, J. R., President of the Consumers' Council, [191] COAL, price of, [167], 19, scheme for the distribution, [152] COAL-mines, taken over by the Board of Trade, 4 CODY, W. F., Obit., 153 COKAYNE, Sir B., nominated Governor of the Bank of England, 20 COLIN Armand, publication of "La Fiance de l'Est," 102 COLL, Sir P., Obit., 165 COLLET, Sir W., appointed Governor of British Guiana, 5 COLLIE, Sir J., appointed Director of Neuro-asthemic Institutions, 13 COMMERCE and Finance in 1917, 143-150 CONNAUGHT, H. R. H. Duke of, appointed Colonel-in-Chief of "The Volunteer Force," 3 CONNAUGHT, H. R. H., Duchess of, Obit., 5, 165, value of her estate, 15 CONRAD, J., "The Shadow-Line," 113 CONSTABLE & Co., publication of "The Coming Democracy," 101, "Diaz," 91, "Expansion of Europe," 101, "Herbert Spencer," 90, "Recollections, Literary and Political," 94, "The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans," 102, "The Russian Offensive," 94 COOK, Sir T., on the raid of *The Field*, [55], [65] CORNWALLIS-WEST, Col., Obit., 181 CORNWALLIS-WEST, Mrs., case against, [50] CORYNDON, R. T., appointed Governor of Uganda, 20 COTTON, Alderman W., Obit., 175 COTTON-JODRELL, Col. Sir E. T. D., Obit., 194 COTTON trade Manchester, opposition to increase of duties in India, [82]; control of, [148] COUNTRY Council, London, Chairman elected, 6, tramways, halfpenny fares suspended, 9 COURTHOPE, W. J., Obit., 168 COUSINS, W. H., Obit., 188 COWDRAY, Lord, head of the Air Board, [181], 1, resignation, [182], 21 COX, Pte. C., awarded the V.C., 9

CRABBE-WATT, J., Obit., 182
 CRADDOCK, Sir R. H., appointed Lieut.-Governor of Burma, [288], 5
 CRAWSHAW, Lady, Obit., 179
 CREAGH, C V., Obit., 190
 CREAM, sale of, [182]
 CREWE, Lord, elected Chairman of the London County Council, 6
 CRIMINAL CASES —Bell, Dr J. H., 13, Bishop, Dr G. H., 19, Malcolm, Lieut., 17, Mason, Mr. and Mrs., [85], Morel, E. D., 17, Sinclair, Dr. R., 20, Wheeldon, Mrs., [85]
 CROMER, Lord, value of his estate, 8, Chairman of the Dardanelles Commission, 24, Obit., 157
 CROSTHWAITE, Sir R. J., Obit., 180
 CROWE, Miss, Obit., 167
 CUNINGHAME, J. C., value of his estate, 13
 CURRIE, Major-Gen., in command of the Canadian Forces, 12
 CURZON, Lord, at the Primrose League meeting, [112], member of the War Cabinet, [155]
 CUST, H., Obit., 163
 CYPRUS, [283]

DARDANELLES Commission, Report, 24-55, [88]
 DARWIN, Sir F., "Rustic Sounds and Other Studies in Literature and Natural History," 110
 DARWIN, H., Chairman of the Air Inventions Committee, 22
 DAS, Rai B. S. C., Obit., 158
 DAVIDSON, Sir W. E., appointed Governor of New South Wales, [328], 17
 DAVIES, H. H., Obit., 185
 DAVIS-GOFF, Sir W. G., Obit., 203
 DEANE, Mr Justice B., resignation, 2
 DECIMAL Association, 123
 DEFENCE of the Realm Act, convictions under, [76], 17
 DENMARK —BRITISH blockade, effect of, [277] HADERSLEBEN, proposed purchase of, [278] STOCKHOLM Conference, [278] Submarine campaign, protest against, [278] VIRGIN Islands, transferred to the United States, [278]
 DENNEY, Rev Prof J., Obit., 177
 DENNIS, J. W., appointed director of a section of the Ministry of Food, 5
 DENT, J. M., publication of "The Shadow Line," 113
 DEPUTATIONS received by, Chamberlain, A., [82], [83], George, D. L., [95], [174], Henderson, A., [97], Rhondda, Lord, [168], [191]
 DEVENTER, Major-Gen J. L. van, in command of the Forces in East Africa, [306], 9
 DEVONPORT, Lord, scheme of voluntary rationing, [60], on the supply of potatoes, [104], resignation, 10
 DEWAR, Lord, Obit., 177
 DEWEY, Adm G., Obit., 155
 DIGGLE, J. R., Obit., 155
 DOBELL, Dr. H. B., Obit., 162
 Dog shows, illegal, 9
 DONOUGHMORE, Lord, member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56
 DONOVAN, Surgeon-General, K.C.B. conferred, 3

DOVER, and on, [26]
 DOVERDALE, Lady, Obit., 161
 DOWNING, Dr A. W., Obit., 185
 DRAMA —Reviues, 188, Plays, new, 188. War plays, 139
 DRUMMOND, G. J., value of his estate, 17
 DRURY-LOWE, Lady L., Obit., 172
 DUCKWORTH & Co., publication of "Honeycomb," 116
 DUDDELL, W. Du B., Obit., 199
 DUDDING, Rear-Adm H. N., Obit., 188
 DUFF, Sir B., Commander-in-Chief in India, 59, orders to Sir J. Nixon, 59, ensuing on, 75
 DUFF, J. D., "Russian Realities and Problems," edited by, 100
 DUKE, Rt. Hon. H. E., temporary Chairman of the Irish Convention, [121]
 DUNDAS, Col. Sir L. G., Obit., 205
 DUNN, Sir W., Lord Mayor of London, appeal for the support of the War Loan, [54], [59]
 DURAN, C. E. A., Obit., 161
 DURSTON, Engineer Vice-Adm Sir A. J., Obit., 163

EASTER Sunday, 7
 ECCLESIASTICAL —BLAKISTON, Rev H. E. D., Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, 18
 GARDINER, Rev. T. G., Canon of Canterbury, 7 Gee, Rev H., Dean of Gloucester, 22 HENSON, Very Rev. H. H., Bishop of Hereford, 22 NORRIS, Ven W. F., Dean of York, 4. RASHDALL, Rev Canon H., Dean of Carlisle, 9 ST. PAUL'S Cathedral, service at, 7 TOYNT, Rev R. C., Canon of Southwark, 12. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, Aichdeacon E. H., Canon of Hereford, 10
 EGERTON, Gen. Sir C. C., appointed Field-Marshal, 6

EGYPT —AHMED Fuad, Prince, Sultan of, [307] Allenby, Gen. Sir E., entry into Jerusalem, [308] CENSUS, [307] FINANCE, [307]. HUSSEIN Kamel, Sultan of, Obit., [307], 194 JERUSALEM, entry into, [308] MILITARY operation, [307] SUDAN, [308]

ELECTIONS —Abercromby, [143], Aberdeen, 7, Clare, East, [121]; Dublin University, 3, Dundee, 14, Inverness-shire, 1, Islington, 20, Kilkenny, 15; Longford, South, 8, Monmouthshire, 13, Norwich, 16, Roscommon, 3; Rossendale, 4, Salford, [180], 20. — method and costs, 84

ELECTORAL Reform, Summary of the Report of the Speaker's Conference on, 80-87, [57], [94]. members, 81, Registration of Electors, 81; reform of the Franchise, 82, redistribution of Seats, 82-84, University representation, 84, method and costs of Elections, 84, Local Government Register, 85, soldiers and sailors, 86, Woman Suffrage 86; miscellaneous, 86

ELECTORS, Registration of, 81
 ELGIN, Earl of, Obit., 153
 ELIOT, Very Rev. P. F., Obit., 198
 ELLIOT, H., "Herbert Spencer," 90
 ELLISON, Lieut.-Col. W. A., Obit., 198
 ELPHINSTONE, Sir H. W., Obit., 151

ELY, Marchioness of, Obit, 178
 ESTATE Exchange, highest price recorded, 14
 ESTIMATES, Aîmy, [79]; Navy, [72]
 ETHÉ, Dr C H., Obit, 175
 EUROPEAN War, the, [1]-[48] *See* WAR
 EVANS, Sir E., Obit, 194
 EXHIBITION, Child's Welfare and Mother-craft, Westminster, 13
 EXPENDITURE, National, report on, [190]
 EXPORTS, value of, 146

FALKINES, Sir L E P., Obit, 156
 FANCOURT, Brig.-Gen St J F M., Obit, 176
 FANSHAWE, Sir A., Admiral of the Fleet, retires, 6
 FARADAY Society, meetings, 124
 FARDELL, Sir G., Obit, 165
 FAY, Sir S., in control of Military Train movements, 2
 FERNAN, H., "The Coming Democracy," 101
Field, The, office, raid on, [55], [65], [148]
 FIENNES, G., "Sea Power and Freedom," 96
 FIGGIS, J. N., "Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton," 89
 FINANCE and Commerce in 1917, 148-150
 FINLAND —ELECTIONS, [259] INDEPENDENCE of, [259]
 FIRES —LOSSES from, 149
 NORTH MIDLANDS, munitions works, 21
 TRONDHJEM, [282]
 FISHER, A., member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24
 FISHER, Rt Hon H A L., appointed President of the Board of Education, [102]
 FISHER, Lord, evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 31, 32, 36, views on the expedition, 41, 43-45, resignation, 42
 FISHER, S. M., elected Associate of the Royal Academy, 8, 135
 FISHER, Rt Hon W H., President of the Local Government Board, 12
 FITZMAURICE, Capt the Hon. J. T., Obit, 167
 FLEET, Dr J. F., Obit, 161
 FOLJAMBE, Rt. Hon F. J. S., Obit, 158
 FOOD, Control Committees, Local, [165], powers, [192]
 —— Controller, measures, [54], [77]
 —— economy campaign, [168], 18
 —— Ministry of, Consumers' Council, [191]
 —— Orders on, [105], [106], [115], [192]; prices of, [78], [105], [107], 6, 14, 21, supply, [49], [54], [60], [78], [104], [191]
 FORDHAM, Mr., Metropolitan Police Magistrate, resignation, 12
 FORESTER, Lord, Obit, 202
 FORMAN, H B., Obit, 177
 FRANCE.—ALMEYREDA, M., editor of the *Bonnet Rouge*, arrested, [202]. Alsace-Lorraine, restoration of, [200], [201]. Army Medical Services, Committee of Enquiry, 16. BARTOU, M., Foreign Minister, [201]. Briand, M., resignation, [196]. 5. CABINET War Committee, [197], [200] Caillaux, M., charge against, [202]. Cambrai, victory at, 21. Chamber of Deputies, secret session, [198]. Clemenceau, Piemel, [201]; policy, [202] FOCH, General, appointed Chief of the General Staff, 9. GERMANY, peace proposals, [195], [201] INTER-Allied Conference, Paris, 21. LOANS, issue of, [200] Lyautey, General, War Minister, resignation, [196] MAN-power Bill, [196] Military operations in the West, [1], [13], [21]-[24], [32]-[34] Ministry, the new, [196], [200], [201] NIVELLE, General, in command of an Army Group, 9 PAINLEVÉ, M., Premier, [200], policy, [200] Parliament, opened, 2 Pétain, General, appointed Chief of the General Staff, 8 in command of the Northern Armies, 9 Poincaré, M., congratulations from King George V., 1; on the victory of Cambrai, 21 Prisoners, capture of, [14], [23], [33] RIBOT, A., Premier, [196]; policy, [197]; views on peace, [198], resignation, [200], 17, Minister for Foreign Affairs, [200]; resignation, [201] Russia, formula of peace, [197], agreement with, [199], [220] SOCIALIST Party, National Council Conference, [198]; on peace proposals, [195], [198] Stockholm Conference, [197] WAR, expenditure, [199]
 FRANCE's Day, celebrated in London, 13
 FRANCHISE, reform of the, 82
 FRANK, Sir H., appointed Director-General of Lands for the Air Ministry, 23
 FRANKLIN, Surgeon-Gen. Sir B., Obit, 161
 FRENCH, Viscount, Knight of the Order of St Patrick, 10
 FRYER, Lieut.-Gen Sir J., Obit, 157
 FULLER, Sir B., appointed Controller of timber, 4
 GAINSBOROUGH, T., sale of his portraits, 6, 8
 GALSWORTHY, J., "Beyond," 115
 GEDDES, Sir A., appointed Minister of National Service, [175], 15, 16; at Edinburgh, [175], Nottingham, [176], Plymouth, [184]
 GEDDES, Sir E., member of the Board of Admiralty, [126], First Lord of the Admiralty, [155], 15
 GEORGE V., King, congratulations to M. Poincaré, 1, at St Paul's Cathedral, 7; receives members of the Imperial War Cabinet, [117], tour through munition factories, 9, investiture in Hyde Park, 10, birthday honours, 10, relinquishes German titles, 11, 14; institutes two new Orders, 12, visit to the Grand Fleet, 12, tour of the Clyde, 18; at Whippes Cross War Hospital, 21
 GEORGE, Rt. Hon D. Lloyd, on the War Loan, [53], at Carnarvon, [53]; plot to murder, [59], [85], on the National Service scheme, [61]; the Russian revolution, [92]; the entry of the United States into the war, [101], at the Guildhall, [110], on the Government of Ireland, [118]; proposal of a Convention, [119]; on industrial unrest, [141]; at Glasgow, [149]; freedom of

the city of Dundee, [149]; member of the War Cabinet, [155]; on terms of peace, [158]; on Mr. Henderson's attitude to the Stockholm Conference, [162]; at Birkenhead, [172], the Royal Albert Hall, [174]; speech at Paris, [184]; opinion of Lord Lansdowne's letter, [186], on war-aims, [193]; libel action, 19

GEORGE, Sir E., elected Royal Academician, 8, 135

GEORGE, W. L., "The Intelligence of Woman," 107

"GEORGIAN Poetry," 104

GERMANY.—AIR-RAIDS, [30], [31], [39], 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16 Austria-Hungary, relations with, [218]; BANKS in London, report on, [50], 11. Bethmann-Hollweg, Herr von, policy, [210], resignation, [218], 13. Budget, [216]. FOOD, shortage, [216]. HERTLING, Count von, Chancellor, [222]. Hindenburg, Marshal von, Chief of the General Staff, policy, [10]. ITALY, military operations against, [34]-[37]. JAGOW, Herr von, resignation, [5], [211], policy, [210]. KUHLMANN, Baron von, Foreign Minister, [220], on prolonging the war, [44], [221]; at Brest-Litovsk, [47]. LOANS, issue of, [215], [222]. MICHAELIS, Dr., Imperial Chancellor, [158], [219], 13; speeches, [158], [219], [220], on the agreement between France and Russia, [199], [220], reply to the Pope's Peace Note, [221]; resignation, [222]. Military operations in the East, [2], [18], [31], in the West, [1], [10]-[14], [21]-[24], [32]-[34]. Mine-sweeping vessels, sunk, 17. Ministry, the new, [220]. NAVY, mutiny, [222]. Neutral countries, note to, [211]. OESSEL operations, [40]. PARLIAMENT "Free Committee," [221]. Peace negotiations, [43], [209], [211]. Political parties, three, [209]. Prisoners, capture of, [13], [23], [32], [38], [37], [41]. Prussian Parliament, reform, [222]. RIGA, captured, [31]. RUSSIA, armistice with, [15], [46], peace formula, [216], peace negotiations, [44]-[46], [222]. SCHEIDEMANN, Herr, peace terms, [217]. Stockholm Conference, [217]. Submarine campaign, [4]-[10], [25]-[29]. UNITED STATES, Note to, [5], [212]-[214], memorandum, [6], [214], diplomatic relations severed, [215], [311], 7. WALLACHIA, conquest of, [2]. War aims, problem, [216], resolution on, [219]; casualties, [209], 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, expenditure, [215], [216], third anniversary, 15. ZEPPELIN raids, [30], [39], 9, 11, destruction, [31], [39], 11. Zimmerman, Herr, Foreign Minister, [211]; Note to the United States, [5], [212]-[214]; memorandum, [6], [214]

GILCHRIST, R. M., Obit., 167

GILLESPIE, R. A., Obit., 168

GOLDING, H., "The Wonder Book of the Navy," 96

GOODWIN, Engineer Rear-Adm. G. G., appointed Engineer-in-Chief, 11

GORDON, Brig.-Gen. A. F., Obit., 184

GORDON, Sir H., appointed Controller of the Staff of the National Service Department, 5

GORELL, Major Lord, Obit., 155

GOSSE, E., "The Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne," 89

GOSSELIN, Major Sir N., Obit., 159

GRAHAM, Com. C. E. F. C., Obit., 175

GRAHAM, Sir R. J. S., Obit., 171

GRAHAM, Gen. Sir S. J., Obit., 171

GRANVILLE, Lord, appointed British representative at Salonika, 1, Minister at Athens, 16

GRAYSON, H. M., appointed Director of Ship Repairing Work, 11

GREECE.—GRANVILLE, Lord, appointed British representative at Salonika, 1, Minister at Athens, 16. Guillaumet, Gen., appointed Commander-in-Chief at Salonika, 22. JOUNART, M., Commissioner of the "Protecting Powers," [266]. LAMBROS, Ptof., Prime Minister, resignation, [265]. SALONIKA, Franco-British army at, [264], Government of National Defence, [265]. Sarrail, General, recalled, 22. VENIZELOS, M., Prime Minister, [266]. ZAIMIS, M., Prime Minister, [265]

— Alexander, King of, [266]

— Constantine, King of, abdication, [265], 11

GREENE, E., Obit., 189

GREENE, Sir W. G., appointed Secretary of the Ministry of Munitions, 17

GREENLAND, [329]

GREENFELL, A., Obit., 185

GREY, Earl, Obit., 186

GRIMSHAW, Sergt. J., awarded the V.C., 5

GRIMSTON, W. H., Obit., 199

GROUSE shooting, legal, 15

GRUBMAN, Mr., and H. Booth, case of, 9

GUNDY, Sir W., Obit., 153

GUNTER, Lieut.-Col. Sir R. B. N., Obit., 186

GURNEY, M., Obit., 195

GURNEY, Sir S. A., Obit., 172

GUTHRIE, G. W., Obit., 164

Gwynn, Rev. J., Obit., 166

Gwynn, S., member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24, "Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. Dilke," 89

HADDINGTON, Earl of, Obit., 176

HAG, Sir D., report of his views on the war, [65]

HAIN, Sir E., Obit., 190

HALAKITE, inquiry into, [99], [149]

HALASI, O., "Belgium under the German Heel," 97

HALL, A. W., Permanent Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, 5

HALLER, A., awarded the Davy Medal, 119

HAMILTON, Adm. Sir F. T., Obit., 193

HAMILTON, Lord G., Chairman of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56

HAMILTON, H., "The Compleat Schoolmarm," 106

HAMILTON, Sir I., evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 51

HANNAY, D., "Diaz," 91

HARDINGE, Lord, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, wish to resign, [146], [147]

HARRINGTON, Earl of, Obit., 159

HARRIS, C. A., appointed Governor of Newfoundland, [323], 18

HARRISON, T. F., value of his estate, 3

HARWICK, J. J., Obit., 154

HAVERSHAM, Loud, Obit., 170

HEINEMANN, W., publication of "Beyond," 115; "A Rumanian Diary," 97

HEFAZ, The, [283]

HEMY, C. N., Obit., 192

HENDERSON, Rt Hon. A., plot to murder, [59], [85], at Paris, [161], Petrograd, [161], 10, on the Stockholm Conference, [162], [163], correspondence with Mr. Lloyd George, [162]; resignation, [162], 15

HENDERSON, Lieut.-Gen Sir D., deputed to undertake special work, 19

HENDLEY, Col T. H., Obit., 158

HEPBURN, Sir T. H., Obit., 158

HERSCHEL, Sir W. J., Obit., 195

HICHENS, R., "In the Wilderness," 112

HILEY, E. V., appointed Deputy-Director of National Service, 3

HILL, Sir M., appointed Judge of the High Court of Justice, 2

HODDER & Stoughton, publication of "The Gods in the Battle," 107

HODGE, Rt. Hon. J., appointed Minister of Pensions, 16, member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56

HOGARTH, G., Obit., 168

HOLCROFT, Sir C., value of his estate, 15, Obit., 164

HOLE, W., Obit., 196

HOLLAND, Brig.-Gen. G. E., Obit., 179

HOLLINGS, M. A., "Life of Sir C. C. Scott-Moncrieff," 92

HOLROYD, Sir C., Obit., 200

HONOUR, Order of the Companions of, 12, Burnham, Lord, 16; Lansdowne, Marchioness of, 16, Smuts, Gen., 16, Swettenham, Sir F., 16

HOOD, Capt. B., Obit., 185

HOTEL Cecil, taken over for the Air Board, 2

HOULDSWORTH, Sir W., Obit., 168

HOULT, J., Obit., 195

HOWARD, Sir F., Chairman of the Committee on the Army Medical Services in France, 16

HOWARD, Sir J., Obit., 168

HOWSE, Col N. R., K.C.B. conferred, 3

HUGHES, T. M., Obit., 175

HULL, Dr. E., Obit., 195

HUNT, Rev. H. G. B., Obit., 192

HUNTER, W. H., Obit., 162

HUNTINGDON, Mr., and Messrs. Lewis & Simmonds, case, 136

HUTCHISON, Miss J. G., Obit., 197

HUTTON, E., "Highways and Byways in Wiltshire," 105

HUXLEY, Dr. J. A., Obit., 178

HYDE Park, investiture in, 10

IMPERIAL Defence, Committee of, functions, 29

— War Cabinet, [91], [110], [117]; members at Windsor Castle, [117]

IMPORTS, value of, 146

INDEPENDENCE Day, celebrated in London, 13

INDEPENDENT Labour Party, conference at Leeds, [137]

INDIA — ARMY Medical Service in Mesopotamia, defects in the organisation, 70-74

BESANT, Mrs., released, [290]

Bombay, meeting at, [289]. Budget, [286]

Butler, Sir S. H., appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Agra and Oudh, [288], 5.

CHELMSFORD, Lord, on the system of emigration, [288], at the opening of the Legislative Council, [289]

Compulsory military service, Ordinance, [287]

Cotton duties, [82], [286]

Council, appointment of members, [288], [289], 1, 6, 11, 12

Cradock, Sir R. H., appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Burma, [288], 5.

EMIGRATION, system, [288], [290]

FINANCE, [285]

GOKHALE, Mr., on the government of Hindustan, [290]

Government, censure on, 79

INDIAN Defence Bill, [287]

Inter-Departmental Conference in London, [290].

LEGISLATIVE Council, opening, [289].

Loan, issue of, [53], [286], [290]

MAHSUDS, expedition against, [289]

Meyer, Sir W. S., statement on finance, [285]

Military administration, 78, expenditure, 78

Montagu, Rt Hon. E. S., at Bombay, [290].

PUBLIC Services, report of the Royal Commission, [291]

RECRUITS, number of, [290]

INDUSTRIAL unrest, Committee on, [123], [141], report, [157], reforms, [158]

INGLIS, Dr. E., Obit., 203

INGPEN, A. R., Obit., 188

INVENTIONS, Board of, [73]

IRELAND — ASHE, N., death, [170], funeral, [171]. CHAMBERS, J., appointed Solicitor-General, 6 Convention, [118]-[122], members, [120], meetings, [170]

Cork, riot, [121]

SINN FEINERS, hostile attitude, [121]

ITALY — ALBANIA, protectorate over, [205]

Army, defeat, [35], retreat, [36]

Austria-Hungary, military operations against, [2], [16]-[18], [33]-[37]

CHAMBER, secret sessions, [205]

DIAZ, Gen., Commander-in-Chief of the Army, [33]

Giardino, Gen. G., Minister for War, [205]

Gorizia, victory of, [16], [33], evacuated, [36]

IZONZO, disaster, [35], [206]

LOANS, issue of, [203]

MINISTRY, the new, [206]

ORLANDO, Signor, Prime Minister, [206], policy, [207]

POPE, Peace Note, [205], [207], [208]

Prisoners, capture of, [17], [18]

RAPALLO, allied conference at, [33]; Rome, See of, [207], Russia, formula of peace, [204], mission to, [204]

SONNINO, Baron, on the rights of Albania, [205]

Stockholm Conference, [204]. TURIN, food riots, [206]

UDINE, captured, [36]

WAR, expenditure, [203]

JACKSON, Sir H., memorandum on the expedition to the Dardanelles, 38

JACKSON, Sir J., Commission on army huts, [109]

JACOB, Col. Sir S. S., Obit., 204

JAMES, J. A., Obit., 169

JAMESON, Sir L. S., Obit., 203

JAPAN — BUDGET, [297]. ELECTIONS, [299]. ISHII, Viscount, mission to the United States, [299] KENSEIKI party, [298]. LOANS, [298]. MACAO, port, [299]. Motono, Viscount, on foreign policy, [298]. TERAUCHI, Marshal, Prime Minister, [298]

JELF, Sir A. R., Obit., 183

JELLINE, Sir J., Chief of the Naval War Staff, [128]

JENKINS, H., publication of "The Grand Lodge of England," 105; "The Inteligence of Woman," 107

JERVIS, Hon C. M. F., Obit., 173

JOCKEY Club, racing stopped, 8

JOHNSON, Sir B., appointed Director-General of the Army Clothing Department, 22

JOHNSON, Sir H. J., Obit., 163

JONES, Sir E., appointed Controller of Petrol, 12

JONES, Sir J. P., Obit., 195

JONES, K., appointed Director-General of Food Economy, 6, resignation, 4, on the price of food, [115]

JONES, Commander L. W., awarded the V.C., 5

JONES, O. H., Obit., 151

JUDGES, appointment of, 2, 19, 20

KANE, Adm. Sir H. C., Obit., 158

Kattentum, case, 148

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Capt. the Hon. E., Obit., 182

KAYE-SMITH, S., "The Challenge to Smuts," 116

KEARY, C. F., Obit., 196

KEBBEL, T. E., Obit., 199

KEENE, Major C. J., Obit., 167

KELLEHER, Prof. S. B., Obit., 186

KEMBALL, Major-Gen. G. V., K.C.M.G. conferred, 7

KENDAL, W. H., Obit., 199

KENNARD, Lady, "A Rumanian Diary," 97

KENYON, T., value of his estate, 23

KEOGH, Sir A., G.C.B. conferred, 3

KEPPEL, Rear-Adm. L. C., Obit., 191

KERNANAH, C., "In Good Company," 110

KINNEAR, Lord, Obit., 207

KIPLING, R., "A Diversity of Creatures," 114

KITCHENER, Lord, on the Dardanelles expedition, 28, 36, 37, 47, 48; characteristics, 28; administrative system, 34

KNATCHBULL, Sir W., Obit., 184

KNIGHT, Alderman, Sir H. E., Obit., 202

KNIGHTHOODS conferred, 4, 10

LABORI, M. F., Obit., 165

LABOUR Organisations, Conference, [192] —— Party, Conferences, [55]-[57], [161]-[163]; reorganisation, [180] —— questions, Committee appointed, 21

LAMINGTON, Dow. Lady, Obit., 161

LANE, J., publication of "In Good Company," 110

LANSDOWNE, Lord, letter in the *Daily Telegraph*, on peace, [186]

LAURENCE, R. V., "Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton," 89

LAURIE, Rev. Sir E., Obit., 204

LAW, Rt. Hon. B., terms of his War Loan, [52], at Glasgow, [54], Guildhall, [110], member of the War Cabinet, [155], at the Royal Albert Hall, [174], in Paris, 23

LAWRENCE, Dow. Lady, Obit., 208

LAYARD, Sir H., bequest, 136

LEA, A., value of her estate, 7

LEACH, Sir J. B., Obit., 176

LEE, Sir A., appointed Director-General of Food Production, 4; gift of Cheques, 18

LEEDS, Major A. N., Obit., 186

LETCHWORTH, Sir E., Secretary to the United Grand Lodge of Freemasons, resignation, 15, Obit., 194

LETHBRIDGE, Lieut.-Col. Sir A. S., Obit., 164

LEVI, N., "Jan Smuts," 92

LIBERTY, Sir A. L., Obit., 171

LINDLEY, Sir W. H., Obit., 208

LINDSAY, Earl of, Obit., 165

LITERATURE — Retrospect of, 88-117, Biography, 88-94; Fiction, 111-117; Miscellaneous, 103-111; Social and Political, 98-103; War Books, 94-98

LLOYD, C. H., organist at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace, 1

LLOYD, Col. Sir M. G., Obit., 178

LOCAL Government Register, 85

LONDESBOROUGH, Earl of, Obit., 197

LONDON, cabs, whistling for, prohibited, 16 —— France's Day, celebration of, 13 —— German Banks, report on, [50], 11 —— Institution, School of Oriental Studies, opened, 4 —— and Provincial, and the London and South-Western Banks, amalgamation, 22 145 —— rainfall, 14 —— taxi-cab fares, raised, 20 —— temperature, 11

LONG, Brig.-Gen. W., Obit., 156

LONGMANS, Green & Co., publication of "Alfred Lyttelton, an account of his life," 93, "The Education of the South African Native," 104, "Irish Memories," 108, "Jan Smuts," 92, "Rhododendrons," 103; "Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton," 89

LONSDALE, Dow. Countess of, Obit., 182

LORAIN, Rear-Adm. Sir L., Obit., 171

LORAM, C. T., "The Education of the South African Native," 104

LOW, Sir F., Obit., 188

LOWTHER, Rt. Hon. J. W., Speaker, Conference on Electoral Reform, 80

LOYSON, P. H., "The Gods in the Battle," 107

LUKIS, Sir C. P., Obit., 196

LUTMANN-JOHNSON, Lieut.-Col. F., Obit., 185

LUXEMBURG, Grand Duchy of — KAUFFMANN, Herr, Prime Minister, [269]. Post-war settlement, [269] STRIKES, [269]

LYALL, D. R., Obit., 151

LYONS, Sir J., Obit., 178

LYTTELTON, E., "Alfred Lyttelton, an account of his life," 93

LYTTELTON, Gen. Sir N., member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56

MACARTNEY, Sir W G E, appointed Governor of Western Australia, 3

MACASSEY, L, appointed Director of Ship-yard Labour, 2

MACAULAY, Major H, Obit, 168

MACDONALD, R, prevented from attending the Stockholm Conference, [161], at Paris, [161]

MACDONALD, Sir W C, Obit, 176

MACKENZIE, Sir T, member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24

MACMILLAN & Co, publication of "A Diversity of Creatures," 114; "Highways and Byways in Wiltshire," 105, "Life of Algernon Charles Swinburne," 89, "Recollections," 88

MACQUOID, K. S, Obit, 178

MAGNAY, Sir W, Obit, 152

MAHONEY, H C, "Sixteen Months in Four German Prisons," 96

MAIORESCU, T, Obit, 180

MAKINS, Sir G H, elected President of the Royal College of Surgeons, 13

MALCOLM, Lieut, case against, 17

MARCH-PHILLIPS, L, Obit, 158

MARGATE, raid on, 4

MARINE Insurance, 148

MARIS, M, Obit, 186

MARR, Dr J E, elected to the Woodwardian Professorship of Geology at Cambridge, 20

MARRIAGES—Abinger, Lord, 12, Anlie, Earl of, 14, Beurre, R, 3, Cadogan, Hon S, 14, Cansbrooke, Marquis of, 14, Coke, Lady A, 14, Curzon, Lord, 1, Denison, Lady I, 14, Duggan, Mrs G E, 1, Evans, Capt C, 11, George, Miss Lloyd, 11, Rodin, A, 3; Serignac, Mme de, 12, Stanley, Loid, 14, Torby, Countess Z, 14, Werner, Major H A, 14

MARSHALL, Col Sir T H, Obit, 165

MARTELL, E W, Obit, 169

MARTIN, Col C, Obit, 182

MARY, Queen, at St. Paul's Cathedral, 7, towed through Munition factories, 9, at the Child's Welfare Exhibition, 13, appointed Dame Grand Cross of the British Empire, 16, at Woolwich, 19, Whips Cross War Hospital, 21

MASHAM, Lord, value of his estate, 10, Obit, 156

MASKELYNE, J. N, Obit, 172

MATHEW-LANNOWE, Major-Gen, Obit, 190

MAUDE, Sir S, military operations in Turkey, [261], Obit, [262], 201

MAXWELL, Brig-Gen F A, Obit, 191

MAX, Adm. Sir W H, member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24

MCBRIDE, Sir R, Obit, 185

McDOUGALL, Sir J., Obit, 170

MCARDY, Sir A., Obit, 185

MCKENNA, S, "Soma—Between Two Worlds," 111

MCVAIL, Sir D. C, Obit, 199

MEADE, Canon the Hon. S, Obit, 160

MEAT, price of, [115], [136], [151], [173], [174], [192]

MERCHANTABILITY, ships, armed, increase in the number, [73]

MERRY DEL VAL, His Excellency Senor Don R., Obit., 187

MESOPOTAMIA Commission, Summary of the Report, 56-80, [144], origin of the campaign, 57, advance on Bagdad, 59, 62, battle of Ctesiphon, 61, Kut relief operations, 63, equipment and commissariat deficiencies, 66, disputes with the Home Government, 67, transport, 68, medical breakdown, 70-75, divided responsibility for campaign, 75-79, censure of Indian Government, 79

METHUEN & Co, publication of "In the Wilderness," 112, "Soma—Between two Worlds," 111

MEXICO—AMERICAN troops, withdrawal of, [330] CARRANZA, Gen, elected President, [330] MINISTRY, the new, [330] VILLA, Gen, expedition against, [329]

MILBURN, Sir C S, Obit, 182

MILITARY Service (Review of Exceptions) Act, committee appointed, [143], [156], convictions under, 2, 4, 8, 13, 19, 20

MILK, supply of, [116]

MILLAIS, J G, "Rhododendrons," 103

MILLS, Rt Rev W L, Obit, 170

MILNER, Lord, member of the War Cabinet, [155], mission to Russia, [237], 5

MINES, iron ore, taken over by the Minister of Munitions, 14

MINERS' Federation, conference on compulsory rationing, [115], on the Stockholm Conference, [161], [163]

MITCHELL, Rt Rev A, Obit, 155

MONTAGU, Et Hon E S, appointed Secretary of State for India, [155]; at Bombay, [290]

MONTENEGRO, [266]

MOORE, W, appointed Justice of the High Court in Ireland, 20

MORGAN, W F. de, Obit, 154

MORLEY, Viscount, "Recollections," 88

MOSCHELES, F, Obit, 207

MOSELEY, A, Obit, 183

MOSS, H W, Obit, 184

MOSTYN, Hon Mrs G, Obit, 161

MOSTYN, Sir P C, Obit, 155

MOTOR spirit, restrictions on the use of, 9

MOTT, Sgt E J, awarded the V.C, 5

MOTTISHEAD, Sgt T, awarded the V.C, 4

MOULTON, Rev. Prof J H., Obit, 167

MOUNT-EDGCUMBE, Earl of, Obit, 192

MUIR, R, "The Expansion of Europe," 101

MULLINGER, Dr J. B., Obit, 202

MUNCASTER, Lord, Obit., 165

MURRAY, Lieut-Gen Sir A. J., G.C M G conferred, 3

MURRAY, Capt. H W., awarded the V C, 5

MURRAY, J, takes over the publishing business of Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co, 8; publication of "The Great Problems of British Statesmanship," 103, "Life of the Rt Hon. Sir C W. Dilke," 89; "Life of Sir C C. Scott-Moncrieff," 92; "Rustic Sounds and Other Studies in Literature and Natural History," 110; "With the New Army on the Somme," 95

MURRAY, Sir O A R, appointed Permanent Secretary to the Admiralty, 17

MUSIC—Retrospect of LONDON String Quartet, 142 LONDON Symphony Orchestra, 141 NEW Queen's Hall Orchestra, 141 OPERA, 140. PRO MENADE Concerts, 141 ROYAL Carl Rosa Company, 141. ROYAL Choral Society, 142 ROYAL Philharmonic Society, 141 SUNDAY Concerts, 141, 142

NASH, V, appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Reconstruction, 20

NATION, The, action against, [109]

NATIONAL Safety, League of, [183]

— Service scheme, [49], [61], [74], [90], [99], 20

— Union of Corporation of Workers, Conference, [116]

— War Bonds, issue of, [173], 18, 144, amount of applications, 19, 22

— War Savings Committee, [105], [114]

NAVAL engagements, Heligoland, 21, Jutland, 17

— Inter-Allied Committee, creation, 21

— War Staff, [126]

NELSON, Hou, the Rev J. H., Obit, 192

NETHERLANDS, THE—AMSTERDAM, food riots, [270] BELGIANS, German deportations, [269] GREAT Britain, disputes with, [270] LINERS, submarine attack on, [270] Loan, issue of, [269] SUBMARINE campaign, protest against, [270] TOWNLEY, Sir W, appointed British Minister at the Hague, 2

NEW Year Honours, list of, 1, 4

NEW ZEALAND—BUDGET, [341] COAL strike, [340] Compulsory Service Act, [339] EXPEDITIONARY Force Reserve, Divisions, [341] LOAN, issue of, [341]. MASSEY, W F, in London, [340] WAR Conference in London, [340] Ward, Sir J, in London, [340]

NEWDEGATE, F A N, appointed Governor of Tasmania, 3

NEWFOUNDLAND—COALITION Ministry, [328] HARRIS, C. A, appointed Governor, [328], 18 LLOYD, W, Prime Minister, [329] MORRIS, Sir E P, resignation, [329]

NEWINGTON, H F. H, Obit, 184

NEWNHAM-DAVIS, Lieut-Col N, Obit, 173

NICHOLSON, Field-Marshal Lord, President of the Army Act, [49], member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24

NICHOLSON, Major-Gen. S J, Obit, 168

NISBET & Co, publication of "The Challenge to Sirius," 116

NITROGEN supply, research on, 122

NIXON, Gen Sir J, in command of the troops at Basra, 58; orders from Sir B Duff, 59; censure on, 69

NOEL, Lieut-Col the Hon. E, Obit, 202

NORFOLK, Duke of, value of his estate, 9; Obit, 160

NORMAN, M, appointed Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England, 20

NORMAN, Surgeon-Gen W H, Director-General of the Naval Medical Department, 10

NORTH, Col D, Obit, 203

NORTHCILFFE, Lord, refuses appointment of an Minister, [181], Chairman of the Civil Aerial Transport Committee, 9, sails for America, 11

NORWAY—CHRISTIANIA, conference of the Scandinavian Kings, [283]. Food, shortage, [282] RAUTENFELS, Baron von, arrested, [282] SHIPPING losses, [282] Submarine campaign, protest against, [282]

OBITUARY, 151-208, *see* under separate names

O'BRIEN, P, Obit, 182

O'CONOR, J E, Obit, 152

O'DONNELL, Major-Gen H, Obit, 207

O'DWYER, Dr E T, Obit, 186

OPTICS, Institute of Technical, 121

ORIENTAL Studies, School of, opened, 4

P & O Company and the Union Steamship Co of New Zealand, agreement between, 10

PAGE, W H, on the entry of the United States into the war, [101], [102]

PAGET, Lieut-Col A E S L, Obit, 184

PALMER, F, "With the New Army on the Somme," 95

PALMER, Sir F B, Obit, 178

PAPINEAU, Major T M, Obit, 197

PARLIAMENT.—Opened, [62], 3, King's Speech, [62], Easter recess, [102], re-assembled, [102], [177], 10, 11, Whitsuntide recess, 10

ADDRESS, debate on, in the House of Commons, [62], in the Lords, [63]

BUDGET, [134]

CABINET, reconstruction, [155]

COMMONS, House of, grille removed, [167], 15

CREDIT, votes of, [64], [91], [127], [153], [179], [189]

LODS, House of, reconstruction, [179]

MINISTERS, appointment of, 16

SECRET Session, [127]

WAR Cabinet members, [155]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.—

ADDRESS, Asquith, H. H., [62], Curzon, Lord, [63]; Law, B, [62]

AEROPLANES, supply of, Derby, Lord, [140], Montagu, Lord, [139], Tenterdon, Lord, [140]

AIR Board, Churchill, W, [100]; Law, B, [100]

— mastery of the, Macpherson, J. I, [91]

— raids, Banbury, Sir F, [138], Cave, Sir G, [139], Derby, Lord, [138], Law, B, [138], [175], Strachie, Lord, [138]; Sydenham, Lord, [138]

AIR Service, Baird, J. L, [110]

ARMY Estimates, Churchill, W, [80], Forster, H W, [79]; Guest, Capt, [79], Herbert, Sir I, [80], Lambert, G, [80]

— pay, increase of, Law, B, [182]

BARROW strike, Law, B, [97]

BREAD, decrease in the sale, Bathurst, Sir C, [114]

BREWING, Jones, L, [150], Law, B, [150]

BUDGET, Law, B, [184]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont*

- CONSCIENTIOUS objectors, disfranchised, Cave, Sir G., [187]; Cecil, Lord H., [124], [181]; Curzon, Lord, [190]; Law, B., [181]; McNeill, R., [124]
- CORN Production Bill, Law, B., [142], Lincolnshire, Lord, [159]; Lough, T., [108]; Prothero, R. E., [108], [142], [154], [155], [159]; Runciman, W., [108], [142]
- CREDIT, votes of, Law, B., [64], [91], [127], [153], [179], [189]; McKenna, R., [64], [190]
- CRIMINAL Law Amendment, Cave, Sir G., [68]; Samuel, Sir H., [68]
- DARDANELLES Commission, Asquith, H. H., [89]; Churchill, W., [89]; Clyde, J. A., [89]; Fisher, Lord, [90]
- DOGS, taxation of, Law, B., [116]
- DRINK, restrictions, Cave, Sir G., [64]; Jones, L., [64]
- EDUCATION Bill, Fisher, H. A. L., [102], [160]
- ELECTORAL Reform, Asquith, H. H., [94]; George, D. L., [95]; Long, W., [95]; Salter, [94]
- ENEMY Titles Bill, Lansdowne, Lord, [91]
- EXPENDITURE, control of, Collins, G. P., [154]; Law, B., [154]; Marriott, J. A. R., [154]
- FINANCE Bill, Law, B., [152]
- Food supply, Bathurst, Sir C., [77], [105]; Carson, Sir E., [78]; Devonport, Lord, [104], [107]; George, D. L., [71], [166]; Jones, K., [107]; Milner, Lord, [144]; Prothero, R. E., [63]; Rhondda, Lord, [151]; Roberts, G., [105]; Watt, H. A., [104]
- FRANCHISE Reform Bill, Cave, Sir G., [123], [126], [187]; Cecil, Lord H., [181], [187]; Curzon, Lord, [188]; Law, B., [181]; Long, W., [122]; Samuel, H., [178]
- FRANCHISE Reform Bill for Ireland, Cave, Sir G., [177], [178]; Dillon, J., [187]; Duke, H. E., [178], [187]; Lonsdale, Sir J., [177]; Redmond, J., [177], [187]
- GERMANY, blockade of, Cecil, Lord R., [93]; Hewins, W. A. S., [93]; Hylton, Lord, [93]
- GOVERNMENT, attack on, Churchill, W., [100]
 - Offices, housing of, Curzon, Lord, [67]; Midleton, Lord, [67]
- HAIG, Sir D., report of his views on the war, Law, B., [65]; Wedgwood, J. C., [65]
- HARDINGE, Lord, letter to Sir G. Buchanan, Dillon, J., [80]; Macpherson, J. I., [80]
- HONOURS, sale of, Curzon, Lord, [180]; Loreburn, Lord, [180]
- HOUNDS, slaughter of, Bathurst, Sir C., [63]
- IMPERIAL War Cabinet, George, D. L., [118]
- IMPORTS, restrictions on, George, D. L., [70], [72]
- INDIA, cotton duties, Asquith, H. H., [84]; Barton, W., [83]; Chamberlain, A., [82]; George, D. L., [84]; Norman, Sir H., [84]; Runciman, W., [82]
- INDUSTRIAL unrest, Addison, Dr., [132]; Anderson, W. C., [131]; George, D. L., [132]
- IRELAND, Convention, Asquith, H. H., [120]; Carson, Sir E., [120]; Curzon, Lord, [120]; Duke, H. E., [179], [187]; George, D. L., [119], [179]; Midleton, Lord, [120]; Redmond, J., [120], [178]
 - Government of, Asquith, H. H., [86]; Dalziel, Sir H., [87]; George, D. L., [85]; Law, B., [87], [102]; O'Connor, T. P., [85]; Redmond, J., [86]; Redmond, Major, [85]
 - state of, Dillon, J., [76]; Duke, H. E., [76]
- MEAT, price of, Rhondda, Lord, [150]
- MESOPOTAMIA Commission, Asquith, H. H., [146]; Chamberlain, A., [145]; Clynes, J. R., [146]; Curzon, Lord, [147]; George, D. L., [147]; Hardinge, Lord, [144]; Law, B., [145], [147]; Simon, Sir J., [146]; Smith, Sir F. E., [146]
- METALS Bill, Henderson, J. M., [189]; Jones, L., [189]; Law, B., [189]; Runciman, W., [189]
- MILITARY Service Bill, Crooks, W., [141], Law, B., [93]
 - situation, George, D. L., [194]
- MUNITIONS, work of the Ministry, Addison, Dr., [140]
 - of War Bill, Kellaway, F. G., [111]
- NATION, The, action against, Derby, Lord, [109]; George, D. L., [109]; Pingle, W. M. R., [109]; Russell, Lord, [109]
- NATIONAL Service Bill, Cave, Sir G., [74], Dillon, J., [75]; Essex, Sir W., [75]; Harris, F., [75]
- NAVAL problem, Clifford, Lord, [127], Curzon, Lord, [127]
- NAVY Estimates, Carson, Sir E., [72]
 - pay, increase of, Law, B., [182]
- NEWSPAPER restrictions, George, D. L., [72]; Runciman, W., [72]
- PACIFISTS, Law, B., [66]; Ponsonby, A., [66]; Snowden, P., [66]
- PARLIAMENT, control of, Henry, Sir C., [100]; Law, B., [101]; Samuel, H., [100]
- PASSPORTS, issue of, Cecil, Lord R., [160]
- PEACE terms, Asquith, H. H., [159]; Law, B., [159], [190]; Macdonald, R., [158]
- PENSIONS, question of, Barnes, G. N., [81]
- POTATOES, supply of, Bathurst, Sir C., [78]; Clynes, J. R., [182]
- PRISONERS of War, Cavendish-Bentinck, Lord H., [100]; Newton, Lord, [75], [157], [164]
- PRIVATE Members Bills, Law, B., [63]
- PROPORTIONAL Representation, Asquith, H. H., [125]; Cecil, Lord R., [125]; Chamberlain, A., [125]
- RACE meetings, prohibition, Curzon, Lord, [134]
- RATIONING, compulsory, Bathurst, Sir C., [113]; Buckmaster, Lord, [113]; Curzon, Lord, [113]; Devonport, Lord, [113], [115]; Milner, Lord, [113]
- RECONSTRUCTION Bill, Cave, Sir G., [156]; Samuel, H., [156]
- RECRUITS, rejection, Macpherson, J. I., [164]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

REPRISALS, Derby, Lord, [139]

REVIEW of Exceptions Act, Asquith, H H, [143], Derby, Lord, [157], Edwards, C, [143], Geddes, Brig-Gen C., [156], Macpherson, J I, [143], Pinngle, W, [143]

SALONIKA Expedition, Churchill, W, [80], Law, B, [80]

SEAMEN, pay of, Hogge, J M, [100], Macnamara, Dr, [100]

SHIPPING losses, Carson, Sir E, [112], George, D L, [166]

SOLICITORS (Qualification of Women) Bill, Buckmaster, Lord, [76], Finlay, Lord, [76], Lornburn, Lord, [76], Sumner, Lord, [76]

STOCKHOLM Conference, Henderson, A, [163], Law, B, [163]

STRIKE, Engineers, Lancashire, Kellaway, F G, [130]

SUBMARINE menace, Beresford, Lord, [69], [127], Curzon, Lord, [69], George, D L, [112], Lytton, Lord, [69], [127]

TRADE Corporation, British, Law, B, [143]; Stanley, Sir A, [143]

VENereal Disease Bill, Fisher, H, [103]; Greenwood, Lieut-Col, [104]

WAR aims, Asquith, H H, [128], Balfour, A J, [193], Cecil, Lord R, [128], [193], Ponsonby, A, [193], Runciman, W, [193], Snowden, P, [128]

— Council, George, D L, [185], Law, B, [185]

— expenditure, Banbury, Sir F, [129]; Jones, L, [129]; Law, B, [129], [153]; McKenna, R, [154], Snowden, P, [129]

— Office, criticisms on, Derby, Lord, [77]

— progress, Churchill, W, [128]; George, D L, [128], Law, B, [127]

WOMAN Suffrage, Banbury, Sir F, [123], Cave, Sir G, [124], Cecil, Lord H, [123], [124]; Hobhouse, Sir C, [123], Simon, Sir J, [124], Ward, A, [123]

PATTANI, Sir P D, appointed member of the Council of India, [289], 12

PAULTON, H, Obit, 169

PEACE, Sir W, Obit, 158

PEERAGES conferred, Astor, Lord, 10, Battenberg, Prince A of, 11; Battenberg, Prince L of, 11, Chalone, Col, 10; Devonport, Lord, 10, Dewar, Sir J, 1; Farquhar, Lord, 10, Graham, Sir H, 4, Herbert, Major-Gen Sir I, 10; Hopwood, Rt Hon Sir F, 19, Jellicoe, Adm Sir J, 23, Levee, Sir W, 10, Lockwood, Col M, 10, Northcliffe, Lord, 21, Reading, Viscount, 21, Smith, Sir F E, 10, Teck, Duke of, 11, Teck, Prince A of, 11, Valentia, Viscount, 6

PENNEFATHER, Pres S E, Obit, 187

PERSHING, General, Cominader-in-Chief of the United States Expeditionary Force, [316], 11

PERSIA.—BARATOFF, Gen, enters Hamadan, [284] INDEPENDENCE of, [284]

SYKES, Gen. Sir P., military police force, [284]

PETROL Control Department constituted, 12

PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, Rev O, Obit, 164

PICKFORD, Lord Justice, member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24

PILGRIMS' Club, [102]

PIRRIE, Lord, commercial member of the Advisory Board, 18

PLENDER, Sir W, report on the German and Austrian Banks in London, [50]

PLUMMER, Sir W R, Obit, 205

PLUNKETT, Sir H, Chairman of the Irish Convention, [122]

POETRY Bookshop, publication of "Georgian Poetry," 104

POLAND—FOOD shortage, [259] KUCHARZEWSKI, J, Prime Minister, [260] REGENCY Council, [260] STATE Council, [260] TARNOWSKI, Count, Prime Minister, [260], resignation, [260]

POMEROY, F W, elected a Royal Academician, 22, 135

PORTER, Prof A W, "Thermal Properties of Sulphuric Acid," 124

PORTSMOUTH, Earl of, Obit, 204

PORTUGAL—BRACAMPS, Senor, appointed Provisional President, [277]. COSTA, Dr A, Prime Minister, [276] LISBON, not, [277] MACHADO, Pres, in England, [277], 19 Ministry, the new, [276], [277]. NATIONAL Economic Council, [276] PAES, Major, Prime Minister, [277]

POTATOES, price of, [168], [182], supply of, [78], [104], [150]

PRIMROSE, Capt the Hon N, Obit, 201

PRIMROSE League meeting, [112]

PRISONERS of War, exchange, 2, Conference on the treatment, [148], British, number of, [75], 11, German, 21

PRIVY Councilships conferred, 4, 10, Mahon, Lieut-Gen Sir B, 4, Schreiner, W P, 4

PROSSER, E A, appointed Deputy-Director of Military Train Movements, 2

PROTHERO, Rt Hon R E, defence of his policy, [54]; on the agricultural position, [173]

PUBLIC Documents, 24-87

PUCKLE, R K, Obit, 184

PULLAR R D, Obit, 191

PUREY-CUST, Lady E, Obit, 184

PUTNILL, Gen, Obit, 172

PYROMETRY, 124

RACE meetings, prohibition, [134]

RADFORD, Sir G H, Obit, 183

RADOLIN, Prince, Obit, 183

RAILWAY fares, increase, [49], 1

— men, threatened strike, [166]; demand increase of wages, [185]

RAILWAYS, Military Department of, 2

RAIN, fall of, in London, 14

RAMSGATE, raids on, [27], 6, 8

RANAVALO, Queen, Obit, 173

RATIONING, compulsory scheme of, [60], [177], voluntary, [60], [105], scale of, [183]

RAWLING, Brig-Gen. C., Obit, 197

RECKITT, F, value of his estate, 7

RECONSTRUCTION, Ministry of, appointment of Secretaries, 20

— of Industry, report, [141]

REDISTRIBUTION of Seats, scheme, 82-84

REDMOND, Major W. H. K., Obit, 176
 REDWOOD, Sir B., appointed Director of Technical Investigations in the Petroleum Executive, 19
 RESZKE, E. de, Obit, 173
 REVIEW of Exceptions Act, Committee appointed, [143], [156]
 REW, Sir H., Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Food, resignation, 12
 RHONDDA, Lord, Food Controller, [136], 11, on the food shortage, [169]
 RICE, Col, Obit, 170
 RICHARDSON, D. M., "Honeycomb," 116
 RICHARDSON, Major R. M., Obit, 163
 RIPON, Marchioness of, Obit, 196
 ROBECK, Adm de, evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 52
 ROBERTS, G. H., appointed Minister of Labour, 16
 ROBERTS, Col Sir H., Obit, 206
 ROBERTS, Sir J., Obit, 167
 ROBERTS, Sir J. R., Obit, 192
 ROBERTSON, Sir W., G.C.B conferred, 3
 ROCH, W. F., member of the Dardanelles Commission, 24
 ROCHE, A. A., appointed Justice of the High Court of Justice, 19
 RODIN, F. A., Obit, 200
 RODIN, Mme., Obit, 160
 ROMER, T. A., Obit, 187
 ROOTH, H. G., appointed Metropolitan Police Magistrate, 12
 ROSS, M., "Irish Memories," 108
 ROTHERMERE, Lord, appointed President of the Air Council, [182], 21
 ROTHSCHILD, L. de, value of his estate, 13, Obit, 173
 ROUX, E., awarded the Copley medal, 119
 ROYAL Academy, elections, 8, 135
 ROYAL Society meeting, 119, award of medals, 119
 ROYDEN, Sir T. B., value of his estate, 20, Obit, 187
 RUBENS, P., Obit, 159
 RUM, stocks of, taken over by the Admiralty, 18
 RUMANIA—ARMISTICE, concluded, [45], [264], Army, causes of the defeat, [263] ILIESCU, Gen, on the causes of the defeat of the army, [263] JASSY, proposed reforms, [264]. MILITARY operations, [20] Ministry, reconstructed, [263], [264] WALLACHIA, harvest, [264]
 RUQUOY, Gen, appointed Chief of the General Staff of the Belgian Army, 1
 RUSSIA—ALL-Russia Conference, [248], [252] Allies Conference at Petrograd, [265], 5 Armistice, [15], [41]-[46], [250], [252], [257] Army, character, [14], [20], [47], mutiny, [239], flight, [20], [253] "Battalions of Death," [253] Bolsheviks, [41]-[43], [251] DRAGOMIROFF, Gen, Commander-in-Chief, 8 Duma, suspended, [239], Executive Committee, [240], members, [241]; refuses to be abolished, [253] Food shortage, [237] France, agreement with, [257] GOLITZIN, Prince N. D., Prime Minister, [236]. INTERIM Parliament, [255] Ivolsky, M., Ambassador in London, 9. KERENSKY, M., Premier, [20], [253], flight, [256].

Korniloff, Gen, in command of the army, [20]; rebellion, [254] LENIN, M., chief of the "Commissaries of the People," [256]. Lvov, Prince G., Prime Minister, [242], [249], manifesto, [248] MICHAEL, Grand-Duke, manifesto, [244]. Military operations, [2], [18]-[21], [31]. Milukoff, M., Foreign Minister, [242], war policy, [248]; resignation, [249]. Ministry, the new, [236], [242], [249], [253], policy, [249]. OESEL operations, [40]. PARLIAMENT, political parties, [42], [238], [251], opening of, postponed, [236], reassembled, [237] Peace formula, [250], [252], negotiations, [44]-[48], [257] Peasants' delegates, meeting, [252]. Petrograd, insurrection, [237] [241], proclamation, [238] Politicians, National Conference, [253] Population, [233] Progressive Bloc Party, [233]. Provisional Government, [241], [247]; members, [242] RASPUTIN, influence of, [235], murdered, [235]. Reactionary Party, [238]. Republic proclaimed, 17. Revolution, [13], [14], [232], [237]-[241] Riga, fall of, [31], [254] SAZONOFF, S. D., appointed Ambassador in London, 3. Socialist Party, pacifist opinions, [42], [234], [238], [246], divisions, [251] "Soviet" or Council, character, [246] Stockholm Conference, [250]. Sturmer, M., resignation, [234] Sukhomlinoff, Gen, trial, [255]. TREPOFF, M., Prime Minister, [234], resignation, [236] Trotsky, M., the "People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs," [43], plan for peace, [47] Tsarism, extinction, [245]; system of government, [245] UKRAINI, [258] WALLACHIA, conquest of, [2] Wai, expenditure, [254]. Production, members arrested, [237]
 RUSSIA, Nicholas II, Emperor of, characteristics, [235], rescript, [236], ukase suspending the Duma, [239], course of action, [242], abdication, [243], arrested, [244], removed to Siberia, [258] "Russian Realities and Problems," 99
 SAHIBZADA Aftab Ahmed Khan, appointed member of the Council of India, [288], 11
 SAILORS and Firemen's Union, attitude on the Stockholm Conference, [161]
 S. AUDRIES, Lord, Obit, 174
 SALISBURY, Marquis of, Knight of the Garter, 5
 SALMOND, Major-Gen J. M., appointed Director-General of Military Aero-nautics, 19
 SALTER, A. C., appointed Justice of the High Court of Justice, 19
 SALSBURY-TRELAWNY, Sir W. L., Obit, 204
 SAMPSON, Lieut-Col D., Obit, 161
 SAMPSON, Low & Co., publication of "Sixteen Months in Four German Prisons," 96
 SARAWAK, Rajah of, Obit, 172
 SCARBOROUGH, raids on, [39], 17
 SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN-SONDERBURG-AUGUSTENBURG, Prince F. C. C. A. of, Obit., 196

SCHOOLS, Secondary, Teaching of Science, report on, 119

SCIENCE — Retrospect of, Biological, 125-132 Physical, 118-125

SCIENTIFIC and Industrial Research, Department of, 120

— Societies, Conjoint Board, 123

SCOBELL, Ven E C, Obit., 159

SEFTON, The, centenary, 3

SEATS, Redistribution of, scheme, 82-84

SEBRIGHT, Sir E R S, Obit., 207

SELINCOURT, A. de, Obit., 188

SELJOU, Capt. F. E, Obit., 151

SERBIA. — CORFU Agreement, [266] Famine, [266]. MONASTIR, recapture, [265], [266]

SETON-WATSON, R. W., "The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans," 102

SHARP, Rev J, Obit., 173

SHARP-BETHUNE, Sir A, Obit., 166

SHIPPING DISASTERS — *Athena*, 4, *Ariane*, 22, *Archadion*, [27], 7, *Ariadne*, 14, *Ariadne*, 12, *Astrua*, 6, *Avenger*, 11, *Ballarat*, [27], *Begonie*, 19, *Ben-my-Chree*, [25], 2; *California*, 3; *Cameroun*, 7, *Cameroun*, 10, *Champagne*, 19, *Conncallus*, [25], 2, *Danton*, [26], 6, *Dartmouth*, [27], Destroyers, [28], 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23; *Donegal*, 7, *Dover Castle*, 9, *Drake*, [39], 18, *Gena*, [30], *Glocester Castle*, 6, *Ivernia*, 1; *Laconia*, [312], 4, *Lanfranc*, 7, *Laventie*, 3, *Macao*, [332], *Mary Rose*, [38], Mine-sweeping vessels, 6, 8, *Mongolia*, 12, Neutral vessels, [39], *Noordam*, 15, *Osuna*, 19; *Otrway*, 14, *Parana*, [331]; *Patriot*, [39], Patrol boats, [27], 7, 21, *Pellew*, [39]; *San Fulgencio*, [273]; *Stephen Furness*, 23, *Strongbow*, [38], *Transylvania*, [27], 8, *Tyndall*, 4, *Vanguard*, [28], 13

— Liners, requisitioned, 147

— losses, [7]-[10], [29], [37], [70], [73], [101], [112], [138], [157]

— Ministry, offices, 5

SHORT, H., Obit., 167

SIAM, [291]

SINCLAIR, G. R., Obit., 159

SINCLAIR, Dr R., case against, 20

SINCLAIR, Rev W. M., Obit., 205

SKEFFINGTON, publication of "Sea Power and Freedom," 96

SKEFFINGTON, Rev. S. W., Obit., 153

SKINNER, Col. E. G., Obit., 202

SLAUGHTER, Sir W. C., Obit., 164

SMITH, H., resignation, 14

SMITH, Dr J. W., Obit., 161

SMITH, P. C., appointed Secretary of the United Lodge of Freemasons, 15

SMITH, W. G., Obit., 196

SMUTS, General, in London, 5, at the Imperial War Conference, [98], speeches, [133], [134], member of the War Cabinet, [148], [155], on the policy of reprisals, [175], at Cardiff, [177]

SOMERVILLE, E. G., "Irish Memories," 108

SPAIN.—ALHUCEMAS, Marq., Prime Minister, [273], [276], resignation, [274]. Army, Committees of Defence, [274]

BARCELONA, semi-revolution, [275]

CONSTITUTIONAL Guarantees, suspended, [275]. DATO, Senor, Prime Minister, [274]; resignation, [276]

MINISTRY, the new, [273], [274], [276]

NEUTRALITY, policy, [272], [275]. PARLIAMENT, dissolved, [276]

ROMANES, Count, resignation, [273]

STRIKES, [275]. Submarine campaign, protest against, [273]

SPENCE-JONES, Very Rev H. D. M., Obit., 198

SQUIRE, Dr J. E., Obit., 170

STANLEY, Sir A., on establishing a British Trade Corporation, [92]

STEPHENS, W., "Madame Adam, La Grande Francaise," 93

STOCKHOLM Conference, [144], [160]-[163]

STORM in England, 16

STOUGHTON, T. W., Obit., 161

STRIKES, Engineers, Barrow, [96], Lancashire, [130]-[132], Omnibus, London, [130], 9, Railway, threatened, [166]

STUART, Rev. E. A., Obit., 162

STUBBS, Sergt F. E., awarded the V.C., 5

STUERMER, B. V., Obit., 188

SUBMARINE campaign, [4]-[10], [25]-[29], [69]

SUFFOLK coast bombarded, 3

SUFFRAGE, Woman, proposed, 86

SUGAR supply, [104], [115], 16, distribution scheme, [165], [173], [183]

SUMMER Time, commencement, 7, ended, 18

SUFILO, F., Obit., 191

Sussex, the result of the sinking, [5]

SWEDEN—ALAND Islands, annexation, [281]. EDEN, Mr., Prime Minister, [281]. Election, general, [281] FOREIGN Office, permits transmission of German messages, [281]. HAMMARSKJOLD, Mr., resignation, [279], [280]

MINISTRY, the new, [280], [281]. PEACE Note, [279]. STOCKHOLM Conference, [160]-[163], [280]. Submarine campaign, protest against, [279]

SWITZERLAND, C., Prime Minister, [280]

SWETE, Dr. H. B., Obit., 170

SWITZERLAND—ADOR, Herr G., Foreign Minister, [272]. CALONDER, Dr F., elected President, [272]. ELECTION, general, [272]. HOFFMANN, Herr, message to Petrograd, on the Austro-German peace terms, [271], resignation, [272]. MOBILISATION, cost of, [271]. Muller, Dr. E., elected Vice-President, [272]. SUBMARINE campaign, protest against, [271]

SYDENHAM, Lord, President of the British Science Guild, 120

SYMONS, Dr W. H., Obit., 186

TALBOT, Lord E. B., appointed Deputy Earl Marshal of England, 6

TAMAMES, Duke of, Obit., 173

TANK, amount collected by, 22

— Corps, formed, 14, attack of, [33]

TANNER, Brig.-Gen J. A., Obit., 183

TARIFF Reform, resolutions, [68]. TAXI-cabs in London, fares raised, 20

TAYLOR, G. P., Obit., 170

TAYLOR, S., value of his estate, 10

TAYLOR, Surgeon-Gen. Sir W., Obit., 168

TEA supply, [173]

TEANO, Prince of, Obit., 188
 TECK, A., Duke of, Marquis of Cambridge, 11
 TECK, Prince A. of, Earl of Athlone, 11
 TENNANT, Mrs H J, appointed Director of the Women's Department of the National Service, 3
 THOMAS, R. V., value of his property, 7
 THOMSON, Sir J J, re elected President of the Royal Society, 119
 THOMSON, Gen. Sir M., Obit., 162
 THRING, Sir A., appointed Clerk of the Parliaments, 7
Times, The, announcements in, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, Red Cross Society, amount of the fund, 2, 12, 21, increase in the price, 4, on enemy banks in London, [50], forecast of the National Service scheme, [61], on the report of the Dardanelles Commission, [88], letter from Lord Northbrook, [90], on the submarine menace, [101], the supply of sugar, [115], on the conditions of life in Belgium, [268], Indian emigration, [290], note, discovery of a new "Romney," 136, losses from fires, 149
 TONKS, H., appointed Slade Professor of Fine Art, 134
 TOWNLEY, Sir W., appointed British Minister at the Hague, 2
 TOWNSSEND, Gen., at the battle of Ctesiphon, 61, siege of Kut, 63-66
 TRADE Corporation, British, [92], 145
 —— Unions, Conference, [130]
 TRADES Union Congress, Blackpool, [169]
 TREE, Sir H B., Obit., 187, 180
 TROLLOPE, Mrs A., Obit., 173
 TUCKWELL, G., "Life of the Rt Hon. Sir C. W. Dilke," 89
 TURKEY.—BAGDAD, occupied, [262], 59, 62 Barra, occupied, 58 CABINET, the new, [262] Ctesiphon, battle of, 61 DEBT, amount, [263] JERUSALEM, surrenders, 22 KURNA, surrenders, 58. Kut, siege of, 63-65, surrenders, 65. MESOPOTAMIA, expedition, 57. Military operations, [261] OTTOMAN Empire, position, [260] TALAAT Bey, policy, [262]
 TYLOR, Sir E. B., Obit., 151
 TYRWHITT, Capt R. Y., K C B. conferred, 13
 UNION of Democratic Control, meeting broken up, 2; offices raided, 16
 UNITED STATES.—AIR Service, [317] Army, conscription, [315], [316] Austria-Hungary, war declared against, [226], [319] BALFOUR, A. J., mission to, [316], 11 CHINA, relations with, [292] DESTROYERS, flotilla of, assist in the war, 9 GERMANY, diplomatic relations severed, [215], [311], 7, war declared, [315], 7. INDEPENDENCE Day, celebrated in London, 13 JAPAN, note to, [299] LOANS, issue of, [53], [317]. MEDICAL Corps in England, 9. Merchantmen armed, [312], [313] Military service registration, [316], 10. PERSHING, Gen. J. J., in command of the Expeditionary Force, [33], [316], 11; in London, [33], 11. Pope, Peace Note, reply to, [318] REGISTRATION Day, 10 SHIPS, number of, [317]. Stockholm Conference, [318] TROOPS, in London, 15 VIRGIN Islands, transferred from Denmark, [278] WAR Conference in London, 21 Credits Bill, [315], [317], preparations for, [315]. Wilson, Pres., efforts for peace, [5], reply of the Allies, [51], on terms of peace, [309]-[311]; the submarine warfare, [311], inaugurated President, [313], message to Congress, [313], declaration of war, [313]-[315], [315]. UNIVERSITIES, representation, 84 UNWIN, F., publication of "Two Summers in the Ice-wilds of Eastern Karakoram," 106
 VICTORIA Crosses, award of, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22*
 VIKAR-UL-MULK, N M H., Obit., 163
 VILLARI, P., Obit., 205
 VINCENT BINGLEY Commission, report on the Mesopotamia Commission, 70
 VYVYAN, Rev Sir V. D., Obit., 173
 WALES, H R H. Edward, Prince of, Channan of the Statutory Committee, resignation, [81], tribute to, [81]
 WALKER, Sir T G., Obit., 203
 WALSH, Ven R., Obit., 162
 WALSH, S., Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board, 12
 WALTER, Mrs., Obit., 159
 WAR, anniversary, the third, 15
 —— Bouds, National, issue of, [173], 18, 144, amount of applications, 19, 22
 —— Bread, report on, [136], [150]
 —— Cabinet, Conferences, 2
 —— Cabinet, Imperial, first meeting, [91]
 —— Council, formation, 29, functions, 30, position of members, 31, procedure, 32, meetings, 40-47, 49, 53
 —— Council, Allied, [184]
 —— Emergency Workers' National Committee, policy, [114]
 —— The European, [1]-[48], military operations in the West, [1], [10]-[14], [21]-[24], [32]-[34], in Italy, [1], [16]-[18], [33]-[37], in the Balkans, [2], in the East, [2], [14], [18]-[21], [31], the Middle East, [3], at Sea, [3], [25]-[29], [37]-[39], Submarine campaign, [4]-[10], [25]-[29], German retreat in the West, [10]-[12], in the Air, [29]-[31], [39], fall of Riga, [31], Oesel operations, [40], Armistice in the East, [41]-[48]
 —— expenditure, [64], [179], [190]
 —— Loan, issue, [52], [173], 144; amount, [60]
 —— Office, administrative system, 34
 WARD, Sir A. W., "Germany 1815-1890," 98
 WARD, Lock & Co., publication of "The Wonder Book of the Navy," 96
 WARDLE, G. J., address at the Labour Conference, Manchester, [55], Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, 16
 WARRENDE, Vice-Adm. Sir G., Obit., 153

WASHBURN, S., "The Russian Offensive," 94
 WATERHOUSE, E., Obit., 190
 WATERHOUSE, J. W., Obit., 159
 WATSON, Lieut -Col T C, Obit., 178
 WATT, J., awarded the V.C., 17
 WEALE, W H J, Obit., 169
 WEBB, P. G. L., appointed Deputy Controller of Petrol, 12
 WEDGWOOD, Commander J C, appointed Assistant Director in the Trench Warfare Department, 21, member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56, Report on the Expedition, 80
 WEIR, A., appointment at the War Office, 7
 WELCH, J., Obit., 167
 WELDON, Col Sir A. A., Obit., 180
 WELLS, Prof. C., Obit., 193
 WEMYSS, Vice-Adm Sir R. E., appointed Second Sea Lord, 15; First Sea Lord, [194], 23
 WENTWORTH, Baroness, Obit., 207
 WESTERN, Lieut -Col. J H, Obit., 166
 WESTERN, Sir T. C C, Obit., 158
 WESTGATE-ON-SEA, raid on, 5
 WESTMACOTT, P G, Obit., 189
 WESTMINSTER, Duke, appointed Assistant to the Controller of the Mechanical Warfare Department, 21
 WESTON-STEVENS, Sir J., Obit., 159
 WHEAT, shortage, [106], price, 6
 WHEATLEY, Dr. H B, Obit., 169
 WHIPHAM, Dr. T T, Obit., 199
 WHIPPS Cross Hospital, 21
 WHITEHEAD, Sir J., Obit., 195
 WHITELAW, R., Obit., 159
 WHITLEY Report on Reconstruction of Industry, [141]
 WIELEMANS, Lieut.-Gen., Obit., 153
 WILLCOCKS, Gen. Sir J., appointed Governor of Bermuda, 8
 WILLIAMS, J E, Obit., 181
 WILLIAMSON, Sir A., member of the Mesopotamia Commission, 56
 WILSON, Sir A., evidence at the Dardanelles Commission, 31
 WINSLOE, Col. R W C, Obit., 175
 WINTOUR, U F., Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Food, 12
 WOMAN Suffrage, proposed, [58], 86
 WOMEN, admission to the Bar, proposal negatived, 2
 WOOD, Sir E., Obit., 191
 WOODCOCK, Dr. L., Obit., 161
 WOODWARD, Dr A S., awarded the Royal Society Medal, 119
 WOOLDRIDGE, H E., Obit., 160
 WOOLLEN industry, control of, [168]
 WORDSWORTH, W., Obit., 163
 WORKMAN, F B, and W H, "Two Summers in the Ice-Wilds of Easterne Karakoram," 106
 WREY, Sir R B S., Obit., 156
 WRIGHT, Sir A., awarded the Buchanan Medal, 119
 YAPP, Sir A., Director of Food Economy, [169], 18, campaign, [174], [183], scale of rations, [183], 20
 YEATMAN, E., Obit., 178
 YOUNG, G. M., appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Reconstruction, 20
 ZAMENHOF, Dr L., Obit., 168
 ZEPPELIN, Count F., Obit., 164
 ZEPPELIN raids, 9, 11, destruction of, 9, 11, 16
 ZOUCHE, Lady, Obit., 187

